PUBLIC LIBRARY,
FEB 9 1886
Cleveland, O.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCLI.

FEBRUARY, 1886.

THE CONGO CONFERENCE AND THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

THE conditions under which commerce should be conducted with Central Africa for all future time, and the securities to be afforded to the persons and institutions of Christian civilization established there, were deemed by fourteen foremost nations of the earth to be of sufficient importance to justify an international consultation on the subject. The resolutions of this assembly were believed by thirteen governments to be so useful as to merit approval. It seems that our Government, or rather its executive officer, holds them of so little importance as not to deserve the consideration of the American senate. So it appears by the following extract from the President's message:

"The action taken by this Government last year in being the first to recognize the flag of the International Association of the Congo has been followed by formal recognition of the new nationality which succeeds to its sovereign powers.

"A conference of delegates of the principal commercial nations was held at Berlin last winter to discuss methods whereby the Congo Basin might be kept open to the world's trade. Delegates attended on behalf of the United States on the understanding that their part should be merely deliberative, without impart-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing to the results any binding character, so far as the United States were concerned. This reserve was due to the indisposition of this Government to share in any disposal by an international congress of jurisdictional questions in remote foreign territories. The results of the conference were embodied in a formal act of the nature of an international convention, which laid down certain obligations purporting to be binding on the signatories, subject to ratification within one year. Notwithstanding the reservation under which the delegates of the United States attended, their signatures were attached to the general act in the same manner as those of the plenipotentiaries of other governments, *thus making the United States appear, without reserve or qualification, as signatories to a joint international engagement imposing on the signers the conservation of the territorial integrity of distant regions* where we have no established interests or control.

"This Government does not, however, regard its reservation of liberty of action in the premises as at all impaired; and holding that an engagement to share *in the obligation of enforcing neutrality in the remote valley of the Congo would be an alliance* whose responsibilities we are not in a position to assume, I abstain from asking the sanction of the senate to that general act."

Are these official observations justified? Or has the President been ill advised, and his message been made the vehicle of wholly erroneous statements?

A slight inquiry by the Secretary into diplomatic law, or into the text of the document, would have assured him that his implication that the United States delegates had surpassed their instructions in certifying by their signatures the final acts of the conference was wholly gratuitous. That signature did not make the United States appear as signatories "without reserve or qualification." Not only was the reserve and qualification—that the whole was subject to approval by the home government—contained in the acceptance of the invitation itself, but it was embodied in the text of the final Act which provides that it shall only take effect for each power when that power shall have ratified it. (*Il entrera en vigueur pour chaque Puissance à partir de la date où elle l'aura ratifié.*) Even without this express reserve, by general diplomatic usage the conclusions of an international conference can never be binding on governments until they are ratified. Their signatures gave it no "binding character." It is to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be regretted that the President has thus seemed to ignore both the text of the document and international usage.

But the more important questions relate to the conclusions themselves of the conference and their importance to American interests, present and future. The President admits the need of regulated relations with that region by submitting recommendations for commercial agencies there, and by having formally recognized its principal nationality, although it occupies only about one-third of the country affected. With this nation, as with nearly all the rest of the region, we have no diplomatic or consular arrangements or securities unless those adopted by the conference are accepted. Certainly then it is worth the trouble to inquire what the delegates of so many nations did actually recommend for the common interest of all in their future relations with one-third of a great continent.

A meeting of the principal governments of the world for the sole purpose of promoting the peace of nations, the interests of international commerce and the progress of Christian civilization is an event so unusual that it deserves more than superficial attention. History records many such meetings of powers in order to restrain or ratify warlike aggressions, to regulate the balance of continental power, to define political jurisdictions, or to divide the fruits of conquest. In late years however, and at the primary invitation of the United States, they have repeatedly assembled for the regulation of postal communications between themselves, and for an agreement on scientific questions. Once they have met to capitalize and apportion the payment of the Scheldt dues, which were a burden on international commerce and in the issue of which our Government participated. An examination of the record of the Berlin Conference of 1884, will show a meeting on a still higher plane, suggested by the discoveries of an American citizen, and by the political action of the United States in recognizing a new-born State.

Within the last two decades travelers had forced their way up the Nile, and from Mozambique westward, until the great lakes of Central Africa and the thickly populated country around them had been discovered and partially explored, and a great river found whose destination and commercial utility were unknown. To the task of solving this doubt an American devoted himself with rare sagacity, intrepidity, and pluck. Undeterred by savage nature

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and more savage man, he, during nine hundred and ninety-nine days, traversed a continent which had been dark during all historic ages, and displayed the flag of the newest great nation of time to the most unknown people of the earth. From a line less than one hundred miles from the eastern coast of Africa, until he saw the rise and fall of the Atlantic tide in the Lower Congo, Stanley saw neither fortress, nor flag of any civilized nation, save that of the United States, which he carried along the arterial watercourse of a region inhabited by a people estimated at more than forty millions in number.

Thus was opened up a vast field for the operations of Christianity, of civilization, and of commerce. The American Government claimed nothing from the right of discovery. The enlightened King of the Belgians, mourning the loss of an only heir to his throne, resolved to dedicate a royal fortune to the founding of a free and progressive state in the newly discovered center of a populous continent. Routes were opened, stations established, officers appointed and the work begun. The first appeal for recognition and for moral support was naturally and justly made to the Government whose flag was first carried across the region. The President and Senate responded favorably to the appeal and recognized the occupation as lawful, being founded on treaties having the consent of the native authority, and promising equal and just treatment to all American interests.

But European commercial interests were also involved. European consent was needed. Europe embraced all the colonizing powers. Two of them were already pushing forward their colonial claims to this region. Both of these governments had, for generations, adopted the policy of colonial monopolies, excluding other commercial nations from access to their colonies except on terms of great inequality. Should this region fall under such control, not only the trade and influence of the country which claimed its discovery, but of all other non-occupying governments, would be practically excluded from its benefits. All these nations had a common interest in establishing there the liberty and equality of trade, and in the contribution of civilizing influences. The missionaries of the United States churches were there. Some American manufacturers were making their way there. Six millions of the African races now in America might yet contribute a useful emigration in aid of its civilization. We were already the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

principal consumers of one of its chief products. In much less time than our own Mississippi valley was opened and settled after discovery we might expect the opening up of a profitable trade with the Congo valley and the Lake region of Central Africa, if we could have free access to it from the east and west. The first steps are always doubtful, sluggish, expensive. Later, modern nations march with rapidity and security. How should the United States and other non-possessory nations obtain their equal rights of intercourse with this vast region? How should they be treated among its present and rival occupants? And how should it be known which colonial power really and rightfully controlled the oceanic gateways to this region?

These comprehensive international questions presented themselves to the far-seeing mind of Germany's great statesman—not only Germany's but the world's foremost statesman. They must be settled before indefinite claims had crystallized into rights of unquestioned possession and before the old regime of colonial exclusiveness should be established never to be uprooted. France was already pushing her colonial adventures to the northern bank of the Congo. Portugal was claiming the south bank and indefinitely eastward, claiming indeed both banks by right of prior discovery of only the mouth of this great river. Other European powers were founding establishments and interests there.

The German Chancelor decided to invite a Conference of the commercial nations to consider the questions of, first: Liberty of trade in the Congo basin; second: Freedom of navigation in the Congo and Niger rivers on the basis of that established on the Danube and other international rivers; and, third: What formalities should be observed in order to further effective occupations of territory on the African coasts. In connection with the Government of the French Republic invitations were issued to and accepted by, twelve national governments, which with the inviting powers, constituted a Conference of fourteen nations, in which the minor countries like Denmark and Holland had a voice and veto equal to that of the Great Powers. All questions of forms of government and of territorial right or jurisdiction were excluded from the consideration of the Conference. No dynastic question could be considered. The only non-commercial question before them, if indeed this were not also one, was that which affected the government intending hereafter to occupy parts of the African

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

coasts. To them was addressed the inquiry, what will you agree to do to make certain your occupation of any part of the coast? Every government represented was left absolutely free to agree or disagree to the results of the Conference.

The United States very wisely participated in its deliberations for the protection of its own commercial interests, present and future, against colonial exclusiveness and for the promotion of those views which had already induced the President and Senate to recognize the first free government established in Central Africa. The assembled delegates naturally divided themselves into two groups: those whose governments had colonized or intended to colonize that region, and would therefore like to control its trade, like France and Portugal; and those who, like the United States, only wished for their people liberty of access and equal rights of trade, and the free exercise of their religion and civilizing influences in that newly discovered country. The only essential differences arose from this conflict of interests which at one time threatened to be serious. Under the wise guidance of the German delegates and with the aid of discreet and temperate diplomatists like those representing Italy, England, and Belgium, accord was finally established. It would be an agreeable task to the writer of this article, and not without public interest, to give a sketch of all the accomplished ambassadors and ministers representing the civilized world whose wisdom and moderation contributed to this result. But that description must give place here to the more important definition of their work.

I.

The first of the declarations of the Conference relates to the "liberty of commerce in the basin of the Congo, its embouchures and neighboring countries, together with certain dispositions connected therewith."

This declaration constitutes an agreement on the part of all the governments adhering to it that the commerce of each of their nations shall enjoy complete liberty in all the region drained by the Congo and its affluents, including therewith Lake Tanganyika and its eastern tributaries: also in the Atlantic zone lying on both sides of the Congo basin proper between latitude 2° 30′ south, and the river Logé, prolonging these lines eastward from the Atlantic until they reach the Congo basin: *also*, in the zone lying eastward

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Congo basin and situate between the 5th degree of north latitude and the river Zambesi on the south and extending to the Indian Ocean on the east. But it was expressly understood that the provisions should only apply to the territories of any independent power in this eastward zone (like Zanzibar) after such Government should give its assent; and the Conference powers agreed to use their influence to obtain this consent.

It was also agreed that all flags without distinction of nationality shall have free access to all the shores of the above territories; to all their rivers flowing into the sea; to all the waters of the Congo and its affluents, and to the lakes, and all connecting canals which shall be made and to all the ports on their borders; with liberty of coasting trade and boating by sea and river. No other taxes should be imposed than as an equivalent for the expenses incurred for the benefit of commerce itself. And every sort of differential treatment of ships and merchandise is prohibited. All kinds of commercial monopoly and exceptional privilege are agreed to be forbidden. Absolute equality among nations is established and their commercial rights are to be the same as those of the possessory government. Strangers shall have the same personal rights as the allegiants for pursuing their professions, for acquiring and transmitting property, both personal and real, and generally shall enjoy the same protection and the same treatment.

Not only do the possessory powers agree to all this. They further pledge themselves to care for the preservation of the native races and for the amelioration of their moral and material condition, and to strive for the suppression of slavery, and especially of the slave trade. They pledge themselves to protect and favor, without distinction of nationality or forms of worship, all religious, scientific and charitable enterprises tending to the instruction and civilization of the natives. The possessory powers further guarantee liberty of conscience and religious toleration to natives and strangers and citizens, together with the right of all to erect places of worship and to organize missions without any restriction. (Article 1–6.)

To what of all this does the Secretary of State object? What is there in it that is not profoundly acceptable to the American People? Is it not the very substance of the American Constitution extended to the heart of Africa?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

II.

The regions to be covered by the declarations of the Conference contain the great fields from which the odious slave trade is recruited, and where its horrors continue and its routes are marked by human bones and blood. The governments represented, therefore, recognizing this horrible traffic and the operations by which slaves were furnished for it as interdicted by the law of nations, on the demand of the British ambassador excluded it from the commerce to which liberty was to be secured; and on the demand of the American minister, who reminded the conference of six millions of emancipated blacks in the United States, the possessory powers pledged themselves that their territory should afford neither routes of transit for the slave trade nor markets for it; and that they would employ all the means in their power to put an end to this commerce and to punish those engaged in it. This was a most important step forward in the progress of humanity. (Article 9.)

Does Mr. Bayard object to this second declaration? Is he unwilling to receive this engagement made by the African powers? Do not the American People approve it?

III.

"In order"—says the third declaration of the Conference—"to give a new guaranty of security to commerce and industry, and by the maintenance of peace to favor the development of civilization in the countries mentioned in the first article and placed under the regime of commercial liberty, the high signatory parties of the present act, and those who shall hereafter adhere to it, engage themselves to respect the neutrality (*s'engagent a respecter la neutralité*) of the territories or parts of territories depending on the said countries, including therein the territorial waters, so long as the powers who exercise or shall exercise sovereignty or protectorate over these territories, making use of their option to proclaim themselves neutral shall fulfill the duties which belong to neutrality. (Art. 10.)

This is the precise translation of the declaration on which Mr. Bayard seems to rest the objection of the President to even present the conclusions of the Conference to the Senate. In the message he calls it—for there is absolutely nothing else in the whole act of the Conference to which the wildest imagination could apply his phraseology—he calls this, "a joint international engagement im-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

posing on the signers the conservation of the territorial integrity of distant regions where we have no established interests or control!" He further uses, with special reference to the neutrality clause, the following language: "Holding that an engagement to share in the obligation of enforcing neutrality in the remote valley of the Congo would be an alliance whose responsibilities we are not in a position to assume, I abstain from asking the sanction of the Senate to that general act."

The State Department should really invoke the forbearing judgment of our countrymen. There really are people enjoying salaries in the State Department who, if sufficient time had been allowed, could have translated the words *s'engagent a respecter la neutralité*. Most schoolboys reading English would inevitably have stumbled on its meaning. It is only by a very high flight of imagination that these simple words can be converted into an "obligation of enforcing neutrality," and "an alliance whose responsibility we are not in a position to assume." Surely the Secretary of State is not ignorant that, by international law, we are always bound to "respect the neutrality" of another independent country which itself performs the duties of a neutral toward us. So far, therefore, as the Congo free state is concerned the declaration was only a promise by each government for itself to observe the existing law of nations. But there were included in this broad zone dedicated to free commerce colonies, or parts of colonies, of European powers. There might be many more to come, as well as commercial establishments without colonies. These powers might be at war in Europe on merely European questions. If such alien wars were carried into this part of Africa and among their barbarian subjects they would revive all savage instincts, with the lusts of rapine and slaughter. Thus, in a few months, would be ruined the commercial enterprises, the religious institutions and the civilizing influences of many years. The American minister reminded the Conference of this danger, and referred to the bloody massacres in American colonies at the time of the Franco-English wars preceding our Revolution. France, which already had colonies here, at first objected to any agreement limiting her option to make war from or to carry war into these colonial regions where the Conference had already agreed to the dominant principles of commercial liberty and Christian civilization. But the proposition was finally agreed to in the conditional form above quoted.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Even France accepted it as a partial concession to the future peace and good order of this vast barbaric region. Thus, each government engaged itself to respect the neutrality of all this region, even while war raged between the possessory powers elsewhere, provided the duties of neutrality were observed in this region itself. Thus came the recognition of a rule of existing law to be applied to an African colony of a belligerent, provided the colony was proclaimed neutral, and should take no part in the war; and it was also applied in the interest of the neutrals themselves, such as the United States are and are likely to remain. All this could have been learned, and more fully, by a simple reading of the protocols. But how should they be read at the State Department when even the principal text was not read?

In this spirit of peace and progress, as well as in the line of our own treaty agreements with England for the encouragement of peace by arbitration, the Conference advanced a further step. In another clause of this declaration it is said, if a power exercising sovereignty or protectorate in these regions of free commercial liberty should be involved in war, the government agreeing to the resolutions of the Conference promise "their good offices" that the territories of such power, situate in this free zone, may be, with consent of both belligerents, placed for the duration of such war under the regime of neutrality and considered as belonging to a non-belligerent state; the belligerents may thenceforth renounce the extension of hostilities to these territories, as well as renounce the use of them as a base for the operations of war. (Art. 11.)

In case a serious dissension on the subject of or within the limits of these free territories should arise between the powers agreeing to the acts of the Conference, these dissentient powers, before appealing to arms, promise to have recourse to the mediation of one or more friendly powers; or may take their option to refer the difference to arbitration. (Art. 12.)

Where in all these arrangements for the peace and good order of this region does the Secretary find "a joint international engagement imposing on the signers the conservation of the territorial integrity of distant regions?" Where does he find "the obligation of enforcing neutrality in the remote valley of the Congo?" Can a Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs find no distinction between a simple promise of a government to respect an existing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

neutrality, and an alliance to enforce neutrality on a warring state ?

The blunder put into the President's mouth is so stupendous as to be incredible, except to those who have the original text before them. Thirteen governments of the world will read the misstatement of the message with amazement. In no other country could such an error in so high a document pass without surprise on the part of the people, and regret on the part of the authorities responsible for it. The error is less excusable because the protocols show how many clauses were changed on the suggestion of the American minister, to avoid every appearance of joint liability or joint guaranty, or any other like obligation on the part of the United States. The obligation of this Government is for itself to respect the principle to which it agrees.

I challenge the Secretary of State after the closest scrutiny of the act to quote a single clause in the entire text of the General Act of the Conference, which imposes any obligation whatever on the United States to employ a soldier or sailor or to expend a dollar to enforce neutrality or territorial integrity or any other condition or action on any other government or territory whatever. I further invite him to quote a single phrase in that text which creates an alliance with any other government on the earth for or against any other nation or territory in the world. Until such article of the text is shown the American people may well believe that their minister at that Conference—whose experience in public affairs has been cotemporaneous with that of the Secretary of State, and whose fidelity to American principles and traditions of policy is certainly equal to his—has faithfully guarded these principles and traditions throughout the action of the Conference. So marked was the acceptance by the Conference of the views presented on the part of the United States that Herr Von Bunsen, reviewing the action of the Conference, assigns after Germany the first place of influence in the Conference to the United States.

IV. AND V.

The fourth and fifth of the resolutions of the Conference establish an agreement that the two greatest commercial rivers of Western Africa, the Niger and Congo, as well as all artificial waterways or railroads connecting their waters respectively, shall forever remain open to the navigation and commercial use of all nations,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on terms of perfect equality. No embarrassing or discriminating regulations shall be applied; and other national interests shall have the same liberty and rights on these rivers as those of the possessory powers. No nation may create a monopoly on either river. This navigation is to remain forever free and open to neutral commerce, even in time of war.

The Secretary must remember numerous negotiations on our part in the past, in order to secure less complete privileges in other great international rivers opening from the sea to the interior of continents. Never before have the principles of anti-monopoly been so largely applied and so sweeping, as in the General Act of this Conference. Is there nothing of value in these permanent concessions made by England and France on the Niger, where regular lines of steam navigation now exist, and by all the nations on the Congo, also now occupied by steamers? Or, does the Secretary think so poorly of the spirit and enterprise of Americans as to believe we shall never more have ships and an ocean trade? The late administration looked to an early time when American enterprise should again display the American flag on all Atlantic waters, covering both vessel and cargo with its protection; and they deemed it a duty to prepare the way for the restoration of its prosperity.

Has the present Government no such hope, no such desire? Will not the American people gladly accept these concessions, freely made and made forever?

VI.

The sixth and last of its declarations of policy chiefly concerns the possessory powers. It requires them, if they make new occupations on the coast of Africa, to notify the other governments of the fact, that they may be in a position to make reclamation if required. They also recognize the obligation to assure, in such territories occupied by them on the coast, an authority sufficient to make acquired rights respected, as well as the liberty of commerce and of transit where that is stipulated. So far as this interests non-occupying governments it adds a new security for the commerce and enterprise of their people on the coasts of Africa.

Finally, in all the act under review there is not a clause touching "conservation of territorial integrity" or "enforcing neutrality." There never was a "jurisdictional question" presented for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

consideration. The reserve touching the "binding character" of the act was the same on the part of all the governments. None were bound until the reserved ratification was effected. The Department of State should have remembered that the same act was signed by Belgium, itself a neutralized state under protection. It certainly would not by a possible pledge of war expose itself to a loss of its neutral advantages. The signatures to the act were the same as to the protocols of each of our deliberations, which certified to the several declarations concessively adopted. They simply certified the ensemble of the conclusions to which the Conference had unanimously come. Different ministers made reserves throughout the Conference. All delegates, however, signed the final instrument which set forth only the resolutions which were finally and unanimously accepted, and this was styled "A General Act." Had the State Department taken the precaution to read the General Act before intimating that the United States minister had, in signing, exceeded his authority, it would have found in the very opening language that the act was a simple certificate of the propositions which the delegates "have successively discussed and adopted;" —*ont successivement discuté et adopté* is the precise recital of the text. It further certified that they thought it useful to assemble their declarations in one instrument which they styled "The General Act." Every separate declaration had been promptly reported to the American Government—not one had been disapproved. A neutrality proposition going still further had been specially approved by the administration then in office. The form of this act was adopted by the Conference, instead of the form of treaty, expressly to meet the objections made to the latter form by the American minister; and in order to obviate all just scruple touching the mere form of the instrument. The Conference was expressly notified that we would undertake no joint obligation of any kind. It went further at our request, and provided (Art. 37) that powers not signing might "adhere to its dispositions by a separate act." The General Act was thus certified to be correct by the signatures of the delegates on the 26th of February last, and before the accession to office of the present administration.

With great personal respect for the present Secretary of State, I hold it a duty, not only to myself, and to the Government whose agent I was, but to the truth of history itself, to correct the misinformation touching this international instrument which has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

found place in so grave a document as the annual message of a President of the United States.

There remains only the question, what do we gain by this act of the Conference?

We secure freedom and equality for our vessels and our commerce in all time and through all progressive developments to come, in an area broader than the United States and extending from the Atlantic to the Indian Ocean, together with all its interior waters, and over the canals and railroads connecting them. We secure the abolition of all monopolies, private or corporate. This is to continue, whatever the present sovereign jurisdiction, or the changes of governments to come, and whether they be independent states or colonial dependencies, and in time of war as well as peace. We secure freedom and equal protection for the persons of Americans whether traveling or resident there, for their property, and for the pursuit of their professions and enterprises of every sort. We gain security for the American missionaries, churches, and schools, now or hereafter to be established, and absolute liberty of commerce and freedom of worship. We gain pledges for the extinction of the hateful slave trade. In a word, we gain everything which we could gain by owning the country, except the expense of governing it. What we gain here by adhering to this act is what elsewhere we have been for a hundred years unable to gain by special negotiations with each individual government, from whose colonial possessions we are until this day either excluded or only admitted upon ruinous terms of discrimination.

On the other hand, what do we yield in exchange for this? Neither land, nor soldiers; neither money nor liability to expenditure; neither jurisdiction nor revenue. We simply agree to recognize in other nations the same rights in Central Africa which are conceded to us; and we agree to use our "good offices" with the governments on the eastern coast to obtain their consent to apply the liberal provisions of the act to their territories: in other words, to further our own interests. We further agree to lend our "good offices"—*bons offices*, says the text and only that—to persuade a belligerent having possessions in this free zone, and with the consent of both belligerents, to adopt neutrality for these possessions during any war. These are the engagements, and the only engagements for action, which we assume toward other governments. But this pledge of our "good offices" is hardly startling

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enough to shock the timidity of an administration which represents the spirit of the American people.

The only grounds upon which the President is made to rest his objections to the work of the Conference *do not exist*. If they existed the work ought not to be and would not be ratified by the Senate. Being non-existent the act should be approved by both President and Senate in justice to the present and future interests of the United States, and in the interest of civilization itself. If too late to adopt it by simple ratification, it should be accepted by a "separate act," for which it makes provision.

JOHN A. KASSON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RACE AND THE SOLID SOUTH.

THE discussion of the Race issue and the Solid South has fallen into the hands of ingenious speculators, with many assumed facts and imaginary sequences. So great and complicated a question above all requires common sense, a close observation of facts, and unobscured logic.

The present status shows the supremacy of the whites in social and political rule: while the blacks have all the legal equality that written constitutions can secure. Does intimidation, corruption, force, and fraud on the part of the whites override all legal enfranchisement? And if so, is there any remedy, if desirable, but time? This antagonism of races, whether arising from "previous servitude" or the natural antipathies of race, thus exhibited, makes the black race of the South, for all practical purposes, of no force in the state and national elections. And the white republicans of the South allied to the blacks share the same fate. Thus, as parties now stand, the Democrats rule the South against black and white Republicans with autocratic power. Is this the best thing possible?

Thus the Solid South, united to a few Northern States, by a minority-vote of the whole people, rule. Is this the best for the nation? Will not a toleration of a minority-rule debauch the public conscience, bring the rule of the majority into contempt, and thus self-government be lost? If the "government of the people by the people for the people" is not desirable or possible, would it not be better to come to the rule of an autocracy by more direct methods at once and forever?

If we are not prepared to go back into the old worn-out slums of despotism, what can save us?

Will the superior increase by birth of the blacks do it?

Some years ago I had occasion to compile a comparative table, running for a long term of years, showing that, as a matter of fact, the whites of the slave states increased at a greater ratio than

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the blacks. Has that ratio been changed by the freedom of the slaves? I think not. I know, of my own knowledge, from unquestionable testimony, of three children being killed after birth by their black parents, in my own neighborhood. So I have reason to believe that, by abortion before and by homicide after birth, the increase of the blacks in all the South has been retarded. Immigration to the South is all in favor of the whites. Again, the Solid South has great temptation to make false returns of the black voters—seeing that increased numbers give increased political power. But, admitting the assumption that the blacks are increasing faster than the whites in spite of the influx of whites and the emigration of blacks, how long will that state of affairs exist? Now, the law of population and subsistence applies alike to man and other animals—that is, population depends upon the food. But, in the artificial civilized life of man, the willful destruction of offspring, want of shelter, clothing, medicine, and proper nourishment and nursing, to say nothing of epidemic diseases, falling mostly upon the blacks, the despotic rule of the South will forever keep them in the supremacy. For it is the substratum of every people that perishes first for want of subsistence.

Will education be the remedy?

Education, of course, gives power. But who is to put the "salt upon the bird's tail?" The "Memphis Avalanche," one of the most intelligent of Southern editors, answers that: the South rules from above, and the North from below. That is, in other words, the whites of the South have the ascendency, though the blacks may increase ever so much, and they intend to keep the supremacy. They will oppose the education of the blacks, as before in slavery. Nevertheless the friends of equality before the law must use all the means—and education is one of them—with or without the co-operation of the oligarchy, as in Berea, in Kentucky, where blacks and whites are educated and protected by the mountain people.

Will force succeed?

I think not. Force has been tried, and, like the storm in Æsop's fable of the sun and the winds, caused the traveler to bind his cloak the more closely around him—it was the chief cause of southern solidity. If this was a central despotism, then force by arms would be the remedy, certainly. But the disease is too great and widespread for such remedy, and not suited to a republican

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

form of government. The ten years of such attempt should warn our statesmen not to attempt that remedy again for the dissolving of the Solid South.

What is the true solution ?

The North has the numerical majority, the superior education, and greatest wealth. She, too, must become *solid*. She must hold the government with no equivocal intent. Having given the South full legal equality with the North, she must show that she is determined to stand by and enforce all the penalties of the bond. The South is now very well content to bury, nationally, "the bloody shirt." *She is in power*. It is not the rider of the horse who cries out, "ride and tie," "now dismount, and let the footman take the saddle." The ambitious men of the South, seeing the national honors and emoluments impossible so long as the South usurps undue power and tramples upon the vital principle of self-government—the sacred ballot, one vote and a fair count—will themselves break up the solid South. The blacks must be divided between the northern and southern parties : that will break up the caste of race. That, and time, will make us one people, and blot out the old Mason's and Dixon's line, and all will be equal before the law.

Social equality hardly enters into the political discussion of the race-issue. Nevertheless it does disturb legal rights and the normal relations of the races.*

A word as to the legal right of intermarriage.

Admit that there is a natural antipathy between the black and white races, for argument's sake, is that a reason why marriage should by law be forbidden ? The right of unrestrained

* There are two facts which, generally unknown or overlooked, are of great importance in the consideration of the race-issue. First, the races or nations of blacks in Africa are as distinct in form and intelligence as the whites of Europe. Consider the Moors of ancient times and the Arabs of the late conflict in the Soudan, running down to the lowest type of Africans—Bushmen. These varieties of race by the slave trade has become more or less mingled in American blacks. I have known, myself, Africans of Caucasian face and craniums as far removed from the ordinary Congo as the first of the white race is from the lowest.

The other fact is, that in a little over a half century I have remarked great improvement in the craniums and facial angles in the same families of blacks. So, under favorable surroundings, the progress of races is rapidly advanced—centuries crowding into years. These indisputable facts, as I believe, cannot be ignored in the discussion and solution of the race-issue.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

marriage is denied to the whites and blacks in the South by law. But does not every one see that the law is intended to protect the white, and not the black race, and therefore is unequal in its force, and, so far, works in favor of caste and the destruction of real "equality before the law?" The objections to such a law is: that it destroys the self-respect of and degrades the whole black race. A wise statesman should do all things to cultivate the race, not to degrade it. But I deny the right of society or the state to say whom I shall or will not marry. In this sacred relation no one can justly forbid the inalienable elements of human happiness. But, admit that there is an instinctive repugnance between whites and blacks sufficient to warrant a restraining law of intermarriage, then such repugnance is also sufficient without law, and therefore such law is needless in the main issues, while in its degradation of a whole race, it is *per se* criminal. I conclude, then, all laws recognizing inequality between the races in marriage, in public functions, in churches, in places of travel, in schools, may be safely omitted. As a matter of taste or judgment, if you please, I am in favor of pure breeds in domestic animals, and among the races of men, and even among the white varieties of the race there is reason to believe that those varieties are happiest where intermarriage is confined to the nearest type and closest affinities of rank, education, and sentiment. But as a matter of *right*, and the great principles of human civilization, I would here, as in political power, let all stand "EQUAL BEFORE THE LAW."

I might add that in Europe, where I saw several blacks and whites intermarried, such alliance being there everywhere admitted by law, it created no sensation whatever; as such unions are so few as to cause no fear of any serious amalgamation of races.

Beyond all these data, and in a wider circle, lies the capital assumption that the South is the superior people in that highest development of intellect and moral qualities—*fitness to rule.* They say that the Roundhead, or Puritan civilization of the North, where so much weight is given to wealth as well as narrow views of religion and life, caused the South here, as in England, to rise to political supremacy; and that, after a quarter of a century in a minority and "exile," "the King has come to his own again," and "come to stay." Some of the South's ancient supremacy

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was due, no doubt, to a broader and truer view of religion and human life, making this earth the arena of development and happiness, rather than the uncertain and perhaps untrue substratum and relations of a future and unknown state. Thus the Puritan ideas (like the exclusiveness of the Jewish hierarchy, while, perhaps, it gave certain force of character to that nation, repelled the sympathy of other peoples) excited antipathy in more liberal minds, and give the South allies to a large extent in the North itself.

But the main cause of the South's political ascendency was due, no doubt, to slavery, which, providing for economical wants, allowed the best intellects to concentrate in politics. This was well enough in such an Union as ours—the North playing the part of the belly, and the South the brain. But where, as shown by the late war, the "belly" was withdrawn, the "brain" perished.

The first—Puritanism—is being more and more eradicated by a wider thought in the New Englanders themselves, and, by the large immigration from other nations, especially the Germans, whose views of life are more liberal, and, as I think, more in accordance with natural law. Slavery is gone forever, and the North and South stand at equal vantage in the future race for supremacy. Here, as elsewhere, we rest upon the survival of the fittest, and we shall see what we shall see.

CASSIUS M. CLAY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOME FALLACIES OF SCIENCE.*

"Le génie fait les philosophes et les poëtes : le temps ne fait que les savants."—FONTENELLE.

SIR LYON PLAYFAIR read to the assembled members of the British Association, when they met at Aberdeen, in the early autumn of last year, a discourse both eloquent and well suited to excite the enthusiasm of his audience, already disposed by taste and bias to salute its propositions as gospel. That there were truths in it, no one would dispute; that it was exclusively composed of truth is not so evident to minds unswayed by scientific prejudice. It, at all events, was a curious and complete *résumé* of the scientific mind, of its views, conclusions, and expectations, and is therefore interesting in itself, if not as overwhelming in its persuasions to the dispassionate reader as it was to the sympathetic and selected audience to which it was addressed. Scientific persons usually never address themselves to any other audience than one thus paneled and prepared. They like to see a crowd of their own disciples in their halls ere they let fall their pearls of wisdom. The novelist does not demand that he shall be only read by novelists. The painter does not think that none but painters can be permitted to judge a painting. The sculptor does not ask that every critic of his work shall be a Phidias. The historian does not insist that none but a Tacitus shall pass judgment on him. But the scientist does exact that no opinion shall be formed of him and of his works except by his own brethren, and sweeps aside all independent criticism on a principle which, if carried out into other matters, would forbid John Ruskin ever to give an opinion on painting, and would prohibit Francisque Sareey from making any critical observations on actors. Sir Lyon Playfair's address satisfied his audience, because that audience was composed of persons already willing to be satisfied; but if we can imagine

* Suggested by an Address to the British Association, at Aberdeen, 1885

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

some listener altogether without such bias, if we can suppose some one amongst the auditors with mind altogether unprejudiced, such an one might without effort have found many weak places in this fine discourse, and would have been sorely tempted to cry "Question, Question!" at more than one point in it.

Taken as a whole, the address was an admirable piece of special pleading in favor of science, and of her superior claims upon the resources of all states and the minds of all men. But special pleading has always this disadvantage: that it seeks to prove too much; and the special pleading of the President of the Aberdeen meeting is not free from this defect. We know, of course, that in his position, he could hardly say less; that with his antecedents and reputation, he would not have wished to say less; but those who are removed from the spell of his eloquence, and peruse his arguments in the serene air of their studies, may be pardoned if they be more critical than an audience of fellow-workers, and mutual admirers, if they lay down the pages of his admirably worded praises of science, and ask themselves dispassionately: How much of this is true?

The main object of the discourse was to prove that science is the great benefactress of the world. But is it proved? To the mind of the scientist the doubt will seem as impious as the doubt of the sceptic always does seem to the true believer. Yet it is a doubt which must be entertained by those who are not led away by that bigotry of science, which has so much and so grievously in common with the bigotry of religions.

Let us see what are the statements which the President of the British Association brings forward in support of the position which he gives to Science as the goddess and the benefactress of mankind. First, to do this he casts down the Humanities beneath his feet, as the professors of science always do; and, as an illustration of the uselessness which he assigns to them, he asserts that were a Chrysoloras to teach Greek in the Italian universities he would not hasten perceptibly the onward march of Italy.

What does this mean? It is a statement, but the statement of an opinion, not of a fact.

What is comprised under the vague term "the onward march of Italy"? Does it mean the return of Italy to her pristine excellence in all arts, her love of learning, her grace of living? or does it mean the effort of Italy to aggrandize herself at all cost,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and to engage in foreign and colonial wars whilst her cities groan under taxation and her peasantry perish of pellagra? In the one case the teaching of Chrysoloras would be of infinite value; in the other it would, no doubt, not harmonize with the vulgar greeds and dangerous ambitions of the hour. If the "onward march of Italy" means that she is to kneel to a steam-mill, submit to a standing army, wait slavishly on Germany, and scramble for the sands of Africa, the teachings of Chrysoloras would be wasted; but if it mean that she is to husband her strength, cultivate her fertile fields, merit her gift of beauty, and hold a high place in the true civilization of the world, then I beg leave to submit that Chrysoloras, or what his name is here taken to symbolize, would do more for her than any other teacher she could have. Could the classic knowledge and all which is begotten by it of serenity, grace, trained eloquence, and dispassionate meditation, be diffused once more through the mind of Italian youth it would, I think, produce a generation which would not madly rush to Tripoli, nor accept the veiled tyrannies of State-appointed Prefects.

The scientists take for granted that the education of the schools creates intelligence: very often it does no such thing. It creates a superficial appearance of knowledge, indeed; but knowledge is like food, unless it be thoroughly assimilated when absorbed, and thoroughly digested, it can give no nourishment; it lies useless, a heavy and unleavened mass. It is the fashion in these times to despise husbandmen and husbandry, but it is much to be questioned if the city cad, with his smattering of education, his dabbling in politics, his crude, conceited opinions upon matters on which he is absolutely ignorant, be not a far more ignorant, as he is undoubtedly a far more useless person, than the peasant, who may never have opened a book or heard of arithmetic, but thoroughly understands the soil he works on, the signs of the weather, the rearing of plants and of animals, and the fruits of the earth which he cultivates. The man of genius may be many-sided; nature has given him the power to be so; but the mass of men do not and cannot obtain this Protean power; to do one thing well is the utmost that the vast majority can well hope to do; many never do so much, nor a quarter so much. To this vast majority science would say: you may be as indifferent weavers, plowmen, carpenters, shop-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

men, what you will, but you must know where the spermatic nerves are situated in the ichneumon, and you must describe the difference of microzoaires and miraphytes, and you must understand the solidification of nitric acid. Nor is the temper which science and its teachers seem likely thus to give the human race, one of fair promise. How much have not the men of science added to the popular dread of cholera, which in its manifestation of cowardice and selfishness has so grossly disgraced the Continent of Europe in the past and present year? Their real or imaginary creation, the microbe, has invested cholera with a fanciful horror so new and hideous in the popular mind, that popular terror of it grows ungovernable, and will, in great likelihood, revolt beyond all restraint, municipal or imperial, whenever the disease should again revisit Europe with violence. Again, how many nervous illnesses, how many imaginary diseases, have sprung into existence since science, popularized, attracted the attention of mankind to the mechanism of its own construction? It is a familiar truth that a little knowledge is a dangerous thing, and of no knowledge is it truer than of physiological knowledge. It has been said, that every one at forty should be a fool or a physician, and so far as knowing what to eat, drink, and avoid, every one should be so; but, unhappily, those who become the latter, *i. e.*, those who become capable of controlling their own constitutional ailments and weaknesses, are apt to contract in their study of themselves an overweening tendency to think about themselves. The generalization of physiology amongst the masses means the generalization of this form of egotism. A child who was told and shown something of anatomy, said, naïvely: "Oh, dear me! now that I know how I am made, I shall be always thinking that I am coming to pieces." In a less innocent way the effect of the popularization of physiology is the same on the multitude as on this child: it increases valetudinarianism, nervousness, and the diseases which spring from morbid fears and morbid desires. Those nervous illnesses which are the peculiar privilege of modern times, are largely due to the exaggerated attention to themselves which science has taught to humankind. The Greek and the Latin said: "Let us eat and drink and enjoy, for to-morrow we die." Modern science says: "Let us concentrate our whole mind on ourselves and our body, although our mind like our body is only a conglomeration of gases which will go out in the dark." The classic in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

junction and conclusion are the more healthy and the more logical, and produced a race of men more manly, more vigorous, and more consistent with themselves.

To return to the assertions contained in this address which we now consider: in the address it is stated as a fact which all must rejoice over, that in Boston one shoe factory, by its machines, does the work of 30,000 shoemakers in Paris, who have still to go through the weary drudgery of hand-labor. Now, why is the "drudgery" of sewing a shoe in any way more "weary" than the drudgery of oiling, feeding, and attending to a machine? Machine-work is on the contrary of all work the most mechanical, the most absolute, drudgery. There is no kind of proof that, because the work of 30,000 shoemakers is done by a machine, mankind at large is any the happier for this. We know that all machine-made work is inferior to hand-work; inferior in durability, in excellence of quality, and in its inevitable lack of that kind of individuality and originality which hand-work takes from the fingers which form it. In the "Seven Lamps of Architecture," there is an admirable exposition of this immeasurable difference in quality which characterizes hand-labor and machine-made work; of the stone cut by steam and the stone cut by hand. Let us only consider what ruin to the arts of India has been brought about by the introduction of machinery. The exquisite beauty of Oriental work is due to the individuality which is put into it; the worker, sitting beneath his grove of date-trees, puts original feeling, individual character, into each line graven on the metal, each thread woven in the woof, each turn given to the ivory. Machines destroy all this. They make machines of the men who tend them, and give a soulless and hateful monotony to everything which they produce.

Despite the vaunt of Sir Lyon Playfair, the cobbler who sits on the village green, doing sound, if simple work, honestly, giving a personality to the shoe he labors on, and knowing on what foot it will be worn and whether it will go, is a man, and may be in his own humble way a good artist; but the attendant who feeds the shoe-machine with oil, or takes from it its thousands of machine-cut leathers, is no better than a machine himself; so far from being "set free," he is in servitude. The cobbler on the village green knows far more of freedom than he. This curious statement that hand-work, with its scope for originality and individual interest is slavery, whilst the work of factories, mechanical, monoto-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nous, and done in ugly chambers and unwholesome air, is liberty, is surely the oddest delusion with which the fanatical and biased mind of science ever delighted itself. Who can compare the freedom of the native child in a village of Benares, shaping an ebony or cocoanut toy under the palm-fronds of his home, with the green paroquets swinging, and the monkies chattering in the sunlit bamboos above his head, with the servitude of the poor little sickly and weary Hindoos, thronging in patient flocks the noisome factory-chambers of Bombay?

The president of the British Association seems to expect that all men whom machines "set free" from the drudgery of their daily calling, will all at once do something infinitely better than they did before they were free. But this seems to me a very rash conclusion. If the 30,000 shoemakers are all "set free" in Paris, by the introduction of the Boston machine, is it so certain that their freedom will produce anything better than a good pair of shoes? What greater freedom is there in attending to the machine if they select to do that, or in entering into another trade? —one thing or the other no doubt they must do, if they want to earn their bread? What have they gained by being "set free, and passed from one kind of occupation to another?" I fail to see what they have gained. Have the public gained? It is open to doubt. Where will be the gain to their contemporaries, or to themselves, if these 30,000 shoemakers "set free" become telegraph clerks or bookkeepers? Something they must become, unless they are to live as paupers or mendicants. Where is their freedom? "Set free" is a seductive and resonant expression, but analyzed it simply means nothing in this instance. And, before quitting this subject, let me also remark that if Sir Lyon Playfair knew as much about shoes as he does about science, he would know that a machine to make shoes is a most unwelcome invention, because every shoe or boot which is not made *expressly* for the foot which is to wear it, is an ill-made shoe, and will cause suffering and deformity to the unwise wearer. The vast mass of the population of every "civilized" nation has deformed feet, because they buy and wear ready-made shoes, thrusting their extremities into houses of leather never designed for them. Machines which make shoes by the thousand can only increase this evil. As it is, we never see by any chance any one walk well, unless it be some one whose shoes are made with great care and skill, ad-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

justed to his feet alone, or peasants who have never shod their feet at all and step out, with the bare sole set firmly and lightly on their mother earth. Science can, no doubt, turn out millions of cheap shoes, all exactly alike, but nature will not consent to adopt such monotony of contour in the feet which will wear them.

The President of the British Association speaks of science always as of a Demeter, with blessings in her hands, creating the fullness of the fields and the joys of mankind. But if we resist the charm of his eloquence and look more closely at the tissue of it, we shall not be so content to accept his declarations. What does the expression mean—to benefit mankind? I conclude that it must mean to increase its happiness and its health; all the wisdom of the ages will avail it nothing if it pule in discontent and fret in nervous sickness. Now does science increase the sum of human happiness? It is very doubtful.

Let us take the electric telegraph as an instance of the benevolence of science. Can it be said to make men happier? I think not. Politicians and diplomatists agree that the hasty judgments and conflicting orders which it favors and renders possible, double the chances of internecine quarrels, and stimulate to irritation and haste, which banish statesmanship. In business the same defects are due to it, and many a rash speculation or unconsidered reply, an acceptance or refusal, forced on men without there being time for any mature consideration, have led to disastrous engagements and as disastrous failures. Even in private life its conveniences may have a certain value, but the many troubles and excitements brought by it are incalculable. Niobe hearing of the death of her children by a printed line on a yellow sheet of paper, has her grief robbed of all dignity and privacy, and intensified by a shock which deals her its fatal blow without any preparation of the mind to receive it. The telegraph, bridging space, may be, and is, no doubt, a wonderful invention, but that it has contributed to the happiness or wisdom of humanity is not so certain. Men cannot do without it now, no doubt; neither can they do without alcohol. The telegraph, like nearly all the inventions of the modern age, tends to shorten time but to harass it, to make it possible to do much more in an hour, a day, a year, than was done of old, but to make it impossible to do any of this without agitation, brain-pressure, and hurry. It has impaired language and manners, it has vulgarized death, and it has increased the great evils of im-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mature choice and hasty action; these drawbacks weighed against its uses must at the time prevent us from regarding its invention as an unmixed blessing.

Sir Lyon Playfair, proceeding in his enumeration of the benefits which science confers on man, turns to that most familiar matter, air, and that equally familiar element, water. He speaks with pride of all which science has discovered concerning their component parts, and their uses and effects upon the world. His pride no doubt may be justified in much, but he passes over one great fact in connection with air and water, *i. e.*, that both have been polluted through the inventions of science in a degree which may well be held to outweigh the value of the discoveries of science.

Were we to awake an Athenian of the time of Phidias from his mausoleum, and take him with eyes to see and ears to hear and nostrils to smell, into Blackpool or Belfast, even into Zurich or Munich, he would ask us, in stupefaction, under what curse of the gods had the earth fallen that mankind should dwell in such hideous clamor, such sooty darkness, such foul stenches, such defiled and imprisoned air. He would survey the begrimed toilers of the mills and looms, the pallid women, the stunted offspring, the long lines of hideous houses, the soil ankle-deep with cinder-dust, the skies a pall of lurid smoke, the country scorched and blackened and accursed; he would survey all this, I say, asking by what malediction of heaven and what madness of mankind the sweetest and chief joys of nature had been ruined and forgotten thus? He would behold the dwarfed trees dying under the fume of poisonous gases, the clear river changed to a slimy, crawling, stinking, putrid flood of filth; the buoyant air, once sweet as the scent of cowslips or clover-grass, made by the greed of man into a sickly, noxious, loathsome thing, loaded with the stench of chemicals and the vapors of engine-belched steam. He would stand amidst this hell of discordant sounds between these walls of blackened brick, under this sky of heavy-hanging soot; and he would remember the world as it was; and if at his ears any prated of science, he would smile in their faces, and say: "If these be the fruits of Science let me rather dwell with the forest beast and the untaught barbarian."

Yes; no doubt science can study air in her spectrum, and analyze water in her retorts; she can tell why the green tree dies in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the evil gas, and the rose will not bloom where the blast-furnace roars; she can tell you the why and the wherefore, and can give you a learned treatise on the calcined dust which chokes up your lungs; but she cannot make the green tree and the wild rose live in the hell she has created for men, and she cannot make the skies she has blackened lighter, nor the rivers she has poisoned run clean. Even we who dwell where the air is pure, and the southern sun lights the smiling waves and the vine-clad hills, even we cannot tell how beautiful was the earth in the days of the Greek anthologists; when the silvery blue of wood-smoke alone rose from the hearth fires; when the flame of the vegetable oils alone illumined the fragrant night; when the white sails alone skimmed the violet seas; when the hand alone threw the shuttle and wove the web; and when the vast virgin forests filled the unpolluted air with their odorous breath. Even we cannot tell what the radiance of the atmosphere, of the horizons, of the sunrise and sunset, were when the world was young. Our loss is terrible and hopeless, like the loss of all youth. It may be useless to lament it, but in God's name let us not be such purblind fools that we call our loss our gain.

Repose, leisure, silence, peace, and sleep are all menaced and scattered by the inventions of the last and present century; they are the greatest though the simplest blessings that mankind has ever had; their banishment may be welcomed by men greedy only of gold; but, meantime, the mad-houses are crowded, spinal and cerebral diseases are in alarming increase, heart-disease in divers shapes is the same, and all the various forms of bodily and mental paralysis multiply and crown the triumphs of the age.

Let us turn for a moment to the consideration of politics and of war as these are affected by the influence of science. Sir Lyon Playfair speaks much of the superior wisdom, the superior education, the superior devotion to science, of Germany as contrasted with those of any other nation; he lauds to the skies her enormous grants to laboratories and professors of physiology and chemistry and "original research" (called by the vulgar vivisection); but the only result of all this expenditure and instruction is a military despotism so colossal that, whilst it overawes and paralyzes both German liberty and European peace, it yet may fall over from its own weight any day, like the giant of clay which it resembles. Are we not then justified in objecting to such praises of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Germany, and refusing to render such homage to her? "By your fruits ye shall be judged," is a just saying; and the fruits of Germany, in the concert of Europe and the sum of political life, are dissension, apprehension, absolutism, and the sacrifice of all other nations to the pressure of the military Juggernaut which rolls before her; whilst in her own national life the outcome of the sanguinary lessons given by the government is little better than the barbarism of the middle ages without its redeeming law of chivalry. The incessant and senseless duels which maim and disfigure German youth are a disgrace to civilization, and a duelist may fire three times at an adversary who *never returns the fire* and, killing him at the last, will only be punished by a slight imprisonment, whilst he will be admired and deified by his comrades.* Such barbarous brutality, such insensibility to generous feeling, such universal resort to the arbitration of every trifling dispute by the pistol or the saber, is the chief characteristic of the nation in which science rules supreme! Conscription, that curse of nations, is forced on all weaklier powers by the enormous armed forces of Germany; art suffers, trades suffer, families suffer; and we are called on by a "scientific" mind to admire as a model the nation which is the cause of this suffering, as we are bidden to admire as models also her mutilated and bandaged students, and her blue-spectacled and blear-eyed school-children!

Sir Lyon Playfair traces the defeat of France in 1870 to the inferiority of her university teaching, and gives the opinion of the Institut de France as his authority. It seems a singularly illogical and unphilosophical decision for such an august body to have given forth publicly. The causes of the defeat of France stretch farther back and have deeper roots than can be accounted for by the omission of the state to create more professors and laboratories. The whole teachings of history show that all states after reaching their perihelion, gradually decline and sink into an inferior place amongst the nations. The day of France, as of England, is already past its noon. Neither will ever be what they have been. Neither will ever again give law to Europe, as they gave it once. But so many causes, some near, some remote, have all contributed to bring about that decline which is as inevitable to nations as to individuals, that it is surely most unphilosophic to contend that such decay could have been averted

* See "Times," of September 19, 1885: account of duel in Munich.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by the creation of some hundred or thousand more professors of natural or other science. It may be natural for such a professor to consider such professorships the one universal panacea for all ills; but it is not an opinion in which those who know France best and most intimately would be inclined to coincide. They would conclude that, on the contrary, she has too many professors already; that the grace, and wit, and courtesy, and wisdom, and chivalry have gone out of her since she was reeled from the desks of the school-master, the physiologist, and the notary, and the whole system of French colleges is calculated to emasculate and injure the character of the school-boy before he goes up for his baccalaureate.

The German invasion of France was supported by all which science could do, yet most military judges are agreed that unless the carelessness of her foe had afforded her a fortnight's preparation, she would have been hopelessly beaten on her own territory; whilst, look at the campaign how we may, it cannot stand a moment's comparison with the Eastern marches of Alexander, or the conquests of Roman generals. With none of the resources of modern warfare, these great conquerors carried fire and sword through the whole of the regions known to them, from the sands of Africa to the ice-plains of the Baltic. What is there in modern war, which can compare with the campaigns of Hannibal, the amazing victories of Julius Cæsar, the deeds of the young Pompeiies, the story of every Legion? In the course of last year, with every aid which modern science can invent, and assisted by every facility which modern modes of transit lend to the transport of multitudes, an army was dispatched from Great Britain with orders to reach a city on the Nile: the errand was too difficult to be accomplished; the generals returned with their mission unfulfilled; the country received them with honor. This is the height to which the assistance of modern science has brought the would-be Cæsars of the age.

What child's play would the expedition to Khartoum have seemed to Scipio Africanus or to Lucius Sylla! Yet all the "resources of science" did not save the modern expedition from failure, and, in the face of Europe and Asia, it retreated in ignominy before the barbaric and untrained followers of a half-mad prophet after an enormous expenditure of stores and treasure, and a perfectly useless waste of human life!

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

War has been almost incessant since the empire of science, but it has been characterized neither by magnanimity nor true triumph. Europe, armed to the teeth, is like a muzzled pack of blood-hounds; every nation lives in terror of the others; to such a pass has scientific warfare brought the world. The multiplication of engines of destruction is one of the chief occupations and boasts of a scientific age, and it can claim a melancholy pre-eminence in the discovery of the means to inflict the most agonizing of all wounds through the medium of conical bullets and shells of nitro-glycerine. To have added unspeakable horror to death, and to have placed the power of secret and wholesale assassination in the hands of ignorant and envious men, is one of the benefits which this Egeria has brought to her eager pupil. And when her worshipers laud her to the skies, as does the president of the Aberdeen meeting, their silence on this side of her teaching is at once significant and ominous.

Sir Lyon Playfair is obviously afraid that the Humanities will always obtain, in England at least, a larger place in public teaching and in public subsidies than pure science will be able to do. I wish his fear may be justified. My own fears are on the other side. Science offers prizes to the prurient curiosities and the nascent cruelties of youth with which literature can never compete. To study all the mysteries of sex in anatomy and to indulge the power of Nero in little when watching the agonies of a scientifically tortured or poisoned dog, are enjoyments appealing to instincts in the frame of the school-boy, with which not even the most indecent passage in his Greek or Latin authors can ever pretend to measure attraction. The professors of science need have no fear as to the potency of the charm which their curriculum will exercise over the juvenile mind. Teaching which offers at once the penetration into corporeal secrets and the power of torture over animals, possesses a fascination for the minds of youth which it will never lose, because its appeals are addressed to those coarsest and cruelest impulses which are strongest of all in the child and in the adolescent.

What science is preparing for the future of man, in thus putting the scalpel and the lens into the hands of children, is a darker and wider question. One thing is certain, that in the future, as in the streets and temples of ancient Rome, there will be no alter to Pity.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The acknowledged doctrine of the professors of "research," that all knowledge is valuable because it is, or appears to be knowledge, and that all ways and methods of obtaining it are justified and sanctified, bears so curious a likeness to the self-worship of the Papal dominion and of the Spanish Inquisition that we see, with a sense of despair, that bigotry and despotism in some form or another are fated to reappear so long as human life shall last.

It is significant of the political immorality and readiness to tyrannize over others in the pursuit of their aims, which characterize the scientific classes, that they are willing to admire and support any government which is willing in return to endow their scholarships and erect their laboratories. They are inclined to surrender all political liberty, if by so doing they can obtain a ruler who will build them a number of new colleges, with every new instrument ready to their hands for animal torture and physiological or chemical experiment.

A Lorenzo di Medici, devoted exclusively to the sciences instead of to the arts, would be their ideal sovereign. Public liberties might perish under him as they should; he would give science her free scope, her desired endowments, her million living victims; he would be even too enlightened to refuse her human subjects for the physiological laboratory.

This curious willingness of the pursuers of science to join hands with tyranny, so long as tyranny helps themselves, is the darkest menace of the world's future. In time to come it may assume dimensions and aspects which are undreamed of now. The demand of biologists and chemists to be provided for out of the funds of the state, is a demand which has never been made by literature or art, and would not be tolerated from them. The exorbitant sums insisted on for the establishment of laboratories and professorships, rob science of that character of disinterested devotion which alone makes it worthy of esteem. "Give me a thousand or fifteen hundred a year," says the physiologist to the State; "give me money-grants also for experiments which I may spend at my good option and for which I need return no account, and leave me to cut up dogs and cats and horses at leisure. In return I will give you some new facts about internal hydrocephalus or the length of time a new poison takes to kill a guinea-pig." The agreement may, or may not be worth the State's entering into

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with the physiologist, but in any case the physiologist cannot deny that he makes a good income out of his science, and cannot pretend to any disinterested or philanthropic selection of it. The moment that any man accepts a salary for intellectual work, he must submit to resign all claim to purely intellectual devotion to it. The claims of scientists to be paid and provided for out of national funds has many equivocal aspects, and will have many unwholesome results; whilst the rapacity and insistence with which they are put forward are as unbecoming as they are undisguised. The high priests of modern science are not likely to shed tears like the Greek philosopher Isocrates because they are compelled to take money. On the contrary, they clamor loudly for their maintenance by their nation, with a cupidity which has happily never disgraced either literature or art.

As modern socialism aspires to make the world into one vast allotment-ground, with every man's half-acre meted out to him on which to build his hut and hive his store, so science would change it into one vast class-room and laboratory, wherein all humanity (paying very large fees) should sit at the feet of its professors, whom it would clothe with purple and fine linen, and whom it would never presume to oppose or to contradict.

The world will gain nothing by delivering itself, as it is gradually doing, from the bondage of the various churches and their priesthoods, if in their stead it puts its neck under the yoke of a despotism, more intellectual perhaps, but as bigoted, as arrogant, and as cruel. That this danger lies before it from its submission to the demands of science, no dispassionate student of humanity can doubt.

OUIDA.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AMERICA'S LAND QUESTION.

THE growth and prosperity of the United States have been explained as simply due to a wealth of emigration and a wealth of public domain. We have had labor and land in abundance. Imported brawn and natural resources have been the raw material transmuted by time into the present general welfare.

The people have not readily listened to the suggestion that out of that which has been so largely the means of our prosperity, may spring one of the worst dangers to our social and political well being. Rome fell by reason of great landed estates. "*Latifundia perdidere Italian,*" says Pliny. An American land question is already assuming shape as well as scope; and its bearings can not too speedily challenge public attention and treatment.

The number of great farms is doubling every three years; the renters are gaining on the land owners; private corporations own swaths of territory equal to a dozen States; and, what seems most to have touched the national pride, foreign landlords have possessed themselves of millions of our best acres.

A brief statement of these matters in detail is the best presentation of the American land question.

The growth of large farms will be made to appear from a comparison of statistics gathered in 1870 and in 1880:

	1870.	1880.	Increase.
Farms under 100 acres	2,075,338	2,208,374	10 per cent.
Farms 100 acres or over, and under 500 acres	565,054	1,695,983	200 "
Farms 500 acres or over and under 1000 acres	15,000	75,000	500 "
Farms over 1000 acres	3,400	28,600	800 "

Large farms invariably carry with them, as necessary auxiliaries, tenants and farm laborers. The increase and permanence of the one imply the increase and permanence of the other. An American tenant class doing the drudgery of agriculture, but owning

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not a foot of American soil, is not a pleasing prospect for those who have at heart the continuance of our social and political equality. Yet the census of 1880 tells us that there are more than a million American tenant farmers (1,024,000)—two hundred thousand more than Ireland had in the palmiest day of Irish landlordism.

The kernel of the evil is reached when we come to consider the lavishness with which the public domain has been granted away to railroad corporations. In a large sense these grants have been premiums and largesses offered by Congress for the establishment upon our soil of the landed system that prevailed in feudal Europe. So, at least, they have operated. Behind every land grant to a railroad has stood, as the real beneficiary, some native or foreign landlord.

The first grant was made September 20, 1850, to the State of Illinois in aid of the Illinois Central Railroad. The total number of acres conveyed was 2,595,000. Up to 1861, the railroads received in this manner nearly twelve million acres — Louisiana, Florida, Alabama, and Mississippi, being the States chiefly benefited. The land thus disposed of could not have been valued at over two dollars per acre. The national debt during the years intervening from 1850 to 1860 did not, during any year, exceed $70,000,000. At times it was below $40,000,000. The annual revenue from customs during the same years varied from forty to sixty-five millions. If it were expedient to aid railroad building, this aid should have been voted in money and not in land. The country was rich enough and prosperous enough to tax itself two and a half millions per annum, rather than show itself liberal with the lands reserved by nature for a future generation.

The progress of the evil during the decade 1850–60 was mild compared to what it became in the years intervening from 1861–7. Up to July 1, 1862, Congress had followed the Democratic notion of granting the lands to the States in the first instance. It was a mere fiction, but it operated well in restraining the greed of corporations and in placing them under more local and systematic supervision. With the grant of 12,000,000 acres, direct, to the Union Pacific, by act of July 1, 1862, a new policy was begun. Then, and in the subsequent years, the nation was undergoing the supreme trial of its existence. It was the dark hour of distress and danger. The debt rose from $564,000,000 in 1862, to $1,120,-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

000,000 in 1863, and to $2,681,000,000 in 1864. The great corporations at this juncture seem like harpies rushing in to divide the estate of the dying republic. It became a matter of competition between them to see how much of the public domain they could grasp during this supreme opportunity.

More than a hundred million acres—twice the extent of all the New England States—were fleeced from the people by the corporations during the years of the civil conflict. Thus, while fighting to retain eleven refractory States, the nation permitted itself to be cozened out of territory sufficient to form twelve new republics. The following table, arranged from the figures furnished in Spofford's *American Almanac* for 1885 will show the magnitude of the nation's loss:

Land given by Congress to different States, in aid of railways	36,000,000 acres.
Land given by Congress direct to railway corporations,	136,000,000 "
Total	172,000,000 acres.

Here is an expanse of territory only a little less in extent than the thirteen original colonies, and larger than France and England combined!

The grants, direct, to corporations are thus enumerated by the Librarian of Congress:

			Acres.
July 1, 1862	To the	Union Pacific	12,000,000
July 1, 1862	"	Central Br. Union Pacific	187,000
July 1, 1862	"	Kansas Pacific	6,000,000
M'ch 3, 1869	"	Union Pacific (successor to the Denver Pacific)	1,000,000
July 1, 1862	"	Central Pacific	8,000,000
July 1, 1862 " 2, 1864 M'ch 3, 1855 May 21, 1866	"	Central Pacific (successor to the Western Pacific)	1,100,000
1864	"	Burlington & Mo	2,441,000
1864	"	Sioux City & Pacific	60,000
1864	"	Northern Pacific	47,000,000
1866	"	Oregon Br. Central Pacific	3,000,000
1866	"	Oregon and Cal	3,500,000
1866	"	Atlantic & Pacific	42,000,000
1868 1871	"	Southern Pacific	3,520,000 6,000,000
		Total	135,808,000

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The number of miles of railroad in operation in 1860 was 30,000; in 1870, 52,000; in 1880, 84,000, and in 1885, 120,000. Without land appropriations the growth of railroads has been more rapid in these late years, even relatively, than at any time in the epoch of lavish State aid. The wisdom as well as the honesty of the Congresses of 1861–7 is impugned by these figures.

With a list of the locations of the largest farms and ranches of the United States in one hand, and a map indicating the ranges of territory granted to railway corporations, in the other, it will readily appear how the estates of our future landed gentry have been carved out of the domain lavished on railroads. The following table of foreign and non-resident land-holders in the United States is from the Congressional Record:

	Acres.
An English syndicate No. 3, own in Texas	3,000,000
The Holland Land Company, New Mexico	4,500,000
Sir Edward Reid and a syndicate, in Florida	2,000,000
English syndicate in Mississppi	1,800,000
Marquis of Tweeddale	1,750,000
Phillips, Marshall & Co., London	1,300,000
German syndicate	1,000,000
Anglo-American syndicate, London	750,000
Byron H. Evans, of London	700,000
Duke of Sutherland	425,000
British Land Company, in Kansas	320,000
William Whalley, M.P., Peterborough, England	310,000
Missouri Land Company, Edinburg, Scotland	300,000
Robert Tennant, of London	230,000
Dundee Land Company, Scotland	247,000
Lord Dunmore	120,000
Benjamin Newgas, Liverpool	100,000
Lord Houghton, in Florida	60,000
Lord Dunraven, in Colorado	60,000
English Land Company, in Florida	60,000
English Land Company, in Arkansas	50,000
Albert Peel, M.P., Leicestershire, England	10,000
Sir J. L. Kay, Yorkshire, England	5,000
Alexander Grant, of London, in Kansas	35,000
English syndicate, Wisconsin	110,000
M. Ellerhausen, of Halifax, in West Virginia	600,000
A Scotch syndicate, in Florida	500,000
A. Boysen, Danish Consul, in Milwaukee	50,000
Missouri Land Company, of Edinburgh	165,000
Total	20,647,000

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Here we have an expanse of territory as large as Ireland in the possession of twenty-nine alien absentee landlords. How long will we retain our proud pre-eminence as the consoler of the down-trodden tenantry of other lands when we are nurturing a more gigantic landlordism at home? The native land-holders make an equally formidable array. The late Colonel Murphy left an estate of more than 4,000,000 acres; the Standard Oil Company owns 1,000,000 acres; ex-Senator Dorsey has 500,000 acres in New Mexico, and Disston has over 2,000,000 acres in Florida. We need scarcely recall the Glenn, Vanderbilt and Dalrymple wheat farms or the great cattle ranches of Texas. In New York—the Empire State—there are landlords "full blown" like Mr. Clark and Colonel Church—the latter of whom collects his rents from 180 farms, some of them 500 acres in size, and all made valuable by the increasing density of population.

The landed property of the following three railroads is suggestive of the material still left to be elaborated into landlordism:

The Texas Pacific Railroad owns.....	18,000,000 acres.
The Northern Pacific " "	47,000,000 "
The Atlantic and Pacific Railroad owns.....	42,000,000 "
A total of.....	107,000,000 "

Considering the great wealth of public domain which Uncle Sam had at the outset it is amazing to contemplate the brief period in which he has squandered his estate.

Exclusive of the thirteen colonies and of Texas, which by the treaty of annexation retained the ownership of all the land within its borders, the public domain was made up as follows:

Cessions from the original States.....	229,987,187 acres.
Louisiana purchase	756,961,280 "
Florida "	37,931,520 "
Mexican treaty	334,443,520 "
Texas purchase	65,130,880 "
Gadsden "	29,142,400 "
Alaska "	369,529,600 "
	1,823,180,387 "

We must deduct from these as acres "not available:"

Alaska, with	369,529,600 acres.
The Indian and Military Reservation, with.....	157,000,000 "
Mountain and untillable lands (estimated)	400,000,000 "
A total of.....	926,529,600 "

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This would leave as available, nearly	900,000,000	Acres.
Of this domain, there have passed into the possession of private parties and actual settlers, over	300,000,000	"
Congress has given to the States..... (79,000,000 acres being devoted to schools and 70,000,000 being granted as swamp land).	161,000,000	"
For land bounties for military and naval service ..	61,000,000	"
For canals and wagon roads	6,000,000	"
A total average of.....	525,000,000	"

If to this we add the 172,000,000 acres previously enumerated as granted to railroads, it will be seen that 700,000,000 acres of the 900,000,000 available in the public domain have been disposed of and but 200,000,000 remain. There are private and State land claims amounting to 85,000,000 acres that we have not considered in these figures. Perhaps it may not be overstating the truth to say that the public domain has fewer arable acres to-day than the number granted away so lavishly to railway corporations during the epoch 1861–7.

Certainly, in view of the fact that the number of acres disposed of under the Homestead and Lumber Culture Acts, has averaged 10,000,000 acres per annum during the past five years, its seems clear that by the end of the century we shall have no public lands open for cultivation and that the words of the song:

"Uncle Sam has land enough to give us all a farm,"

will suggest nothing but a sorrowful reminiscence.

A. J. DESMOND.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SHILOH CAMPAIGN.

PART II.

EARLY the next morning I sent for Colonel Jordan, and gave him the notes I had prepared in the night, as to the order of march from Corinth to Pittsburg Landing, and as to the manner in which our attack should be made. These notes served as the basis of the General Order of march and battle, issued on the 3d, as Special Orders No. 8. General Johnston signed the same, as is certified to by General (then Colonel) Jordan, "without modification in a single particular." The fact is, it was agreed between General Johnston and myself, the day after his arrival at Corinth, that all orders relative to preparations for the intended movement against the enemy, as well as for all details of organization, should be left entirely to me. And it was to facilitate the carrying out of this agreement, that Colonel Jordan, my Chief of Staff, became, upon my own recommendation, the Adjutant-General of our united forces.

To dwell upon the contents of the elaborate order of march and battle, referred to above, and upon the preliminary steps taken in compliance with it, would consume more space than I can command in the pages of this Review. Should more minute information on the subject be desired, it can be obtained by examining the original papers prepared at that time, and which are given in full in "The War of the Rebellion ; a Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies," Series 1, Vol. X, Part I, p. 392; and also in "The Military Operations of General Beauregard," Vol. 1, Chap. XIX, pp. 270, *et seq.*

At the request of General Johnston, and before Special Orders No. 8 were published and copies thereof forwarded to the Corps Commanders and to General Breckinridge, I explained, verbally, to Generals Bragg, Polk, and Hardie, in the presence of General Johnston, at my own head-quarters, the general plan of operations

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as suggested by me, and the details of the whole forward movement to be executed in accordance therewith. It was well understood then, that the troops would be marched from Corinth, at the hour appointed—12 meridian—before reception by the Corps Commanders of Special Orders No. 8, and that copies of the same would be distributed to them on their way to the front.

It may "seem evident" to a few friends of General Johnston, that he also had prepared a plan for the projected battle against the Federals at Pittsburg Landing, and that his purpose was that the Confederate assault should be "by columns of corps,"—not, as was the case,—by "an array in three parallel lines of battle."* If such a plan was ever devised by General Johnston, he expressed it to no one; gave no instructions to carry it out; and has left no document—not a written line—to prove that such a thought had ever occurred to him. What purports to be "his plan" of battle, as "summed up" in a telegram forwarded by him to President Davis, on the 3d of April, 1862, is but a synopsis of the strength of General Buell's army; of the position of the three Confederate Corps in their line of march to the front, and of the names of their Commanders. It is clearly no plan at all. The plan that eventually became his, is the plan contained in Special Orders No. 8, and in the Circular entitled, "Memorandum for Officers," which bore the same date, namely, April 3d, 1862. I suggested both of them, and caused both to be written. General Johnston merely adopted them, as Commander-in-Chief of our united armies. It is evident that, though suggested by me, neither of them would have issued from Department head-quarters, had General Johnston not given them his sanction. To that extent, therefore, General Johnston did have a plan of battle, namely, the plan of battle conceived by his second in command, and adopted and endorsed by him.

Our forces should have been ready to move, on the 3d of April, at 12 meridian, at the latest. Such, however, was not the case. Orders had been misconstrued, owing to which delays had occurred that caused the rear columns of the First Corps to file out of Corinth at nearly dark on that day. Fully six hours had thus been lost. The march, on the 4th, was unsteady, irregular, and slow; and when the troops bivouacked that evening, they were not more than ten miles from their starting point. True, the roads followed

* See Col. W. P. Johnston's article in "Century Magazine" of February, 1885, page 620.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were extremely narrow, and traversed a very thickly-wooded country; and it had rained abundantly, which materially increased the difficulties on the way. There was another rain-fall on the morning of the 5th; and most of the men, unused to marching, even on good roads, were all the more retarded by it. Added to those drawbacks, so serious under the circumstances, it had also happened, on the 4th, that part of the cavalry attached to General Bragg's corps, had made a reconnoissance, without authority, it was said, from its immediate commanders—with none, assuredly, from the Commanding General—which assumed such proportions, and created such a disturbance on the way, as to render it next to impossible that the enemy should not have been apprised of the advance of our army.

The formation of our lines of battle was not completed until late on the afternoon of the 5th. It had actually taken us upwards of two days to go over a distance of less than eighteen miles.

As soon as it became certain that no engagement on our part could begin that evening, General Johnston invited his Corps Commanders, and the Commander of the Reserves, as well as myself, to an informal conference, near his head-quarters, which were, at that moment, less than two miles from the enemy's line of encampments. There it was ascertained that most of our men were already without rations; and that the transportation wagons, with the extra rations and extra ammunition, were still far in the rear, with no certainty of their soon coming up with the troops.

When I understood the true condition of affairs, which, it will be admitted, was far from promising, I told General Johnston and the other officers present, that, anxious as I was to carry out the aggressive movement, I had, with their co-operation, striven so hard to bring about, I was not certain but that the delays we had met with on our march, and the lack of food threatening the army, and, added to these, the boisterous and regretful conduct of some of our cavalry the day before, had not already frustrated the object we had in view upon marching our forces from Corinth, namely, to reach our present position, take the enemy by surprise, and especially and above all, give him battle before General Buell's junction with General Grant. I plainly stated that, in my opinion, it were hardly possible to believe the enemy ignorant of our presence so near his lines. That vigilance on our part should be taken as proof of vigilance on his. That such being the case, we would likely find the enemy intrenched and ready to meet, with troops

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

flushed with recent victories, the gallant but as yet undisciplined forces we had marched against him. That none could be more sorely disappointed than I was, at seeing the great purpose we were about to execute probably lost to us through accident and mismanagement. But, that prudence, and a due regard to the safety of the army for future operations, compelled me to say, that I no longer favored an attack, but now preferred inviting one from the enemy, and thus change our offensive movement into a reconnoissance in force; the result of which might bring him nearer to our base and, therefore, farther from his own, and give us, eventually, the chance of retrieving the present lost opportunity.

My remarks were listened to with much attention both by the Corps Commanders and by General Johnston. He admitted the correctness of my views, but said that he still hoped the enemy would be unprepared to meet our onset, and that we could accomplish our end before the arrival of General Buell's army. That our troops were in line of battle at last, and it were better "to make the venture." The order was therefore given to begin the attack at dawn, the next day, according to the plan already agreed upon.

In adopting this course, General Johnston did what he had the unquestioned right to do. I will only say, that he thereby assumed a responsibility which, under the circumstances, I would not have assumed.

It has been stated, in an article published in the "Century Magazine" of February last, to which I have already had occasion to recur in these pages, that, upon leaving the conference just spoken of, General Johnston, turning to one of his staff-officers, said: "I would fight them if they were a million." It is also stated, in the same article, that my proposition then "suddenly" given, was "that the army should be withdrawn and retreat to Corinth;" * * "that General Johnston seemed to be much surprised at the suggestion;" that "Polk and Bragg differed with Beauregard (me), and a warm discussion ensued between him (meaning me) and Polk, in which General Johnston took little part," etc.* These statements I pronounce entirely erroneous. First, General Johnston was too wise a man and too good a soldier, to make the foolhardy remark attributed to him. On the other

* Col. W. P. Johnston's article in the "Century Magazine" of February, 1885, page 622.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hand, his whole conduct prior to his arrival at Corinth, and his reason for yielding to my suggestion of an immediate advance on Pittsburg Landing, namely, to take advantage of General Buell's absence at the time, showed most unmistakably that the fact of attacking one army alone, or two armies combined, was, by no means, immaterial to him. Next, what I said during that conference led to no discussion among the officers there assembled, and to no surprise. The eventualities of war are too great and too numerous to give rise to any such feeling among educated soldiers. Nor was I acting without precedent: "Somewhat similar strategy had been resorted to by Wellington in 1810, when, advancing to attack Massena at Santarem, he unexpectedly found that able officer on his guard, ready for battle, on ground of his own choosing and much stronger than he had anticipated. After making some demonstration in front of his wily adversary, to draw him away from his stronghold, Wellington did not hesitate to retire without giving battle." * And it must be borne in mind that my proposition never was "to withdraw and retreat to Corinth;" but to convert the movement I had myself inaugurated and so strenuously supported up to this moment into "a reconnoissance in force," so as to bring on an attack upon us from the enemy, instead of attacking him as projected, and thus to endeavor, by appropriate manœuvres, to draw him from his base, as already stated, and produce, or try to produce, some compensating result. It was clear that I only proposed this alternative because I deemed my first plan unsafe at this particular juncture, too much time having been lost by us to justify a fair hope of success. To assert that General Johnston had prepared a plan of battle, the main feature of which was to put his army "face to face with the enemy, knowing that the *chief strategy* of the battle was in the decision to fight;" † and that the plan I had formed was merely to appear before the enemy and then retreat to Corinth, is, when set up against existing documentary evidence, a palpable subversion of facts, scarcely deserving more than a passing rebuke.

On the evening of the 5th of April, the Confederate forces, at a distance of less than two miles from the small log structure known as the "Shiloh Meeting-House," occupied three distinct lines of

* "Military Operations of General Beauregard," vol. 1, chap. xix, page 278.

† Col. W. P. Johnston's article in the "Century Magazine" of February, 1885, page 620.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

battle. General Hardee's Corps formed the first line, extending, somewhat obliquely, over a space of nearly three miles, from Owl Creek, on the left, to Lick Creek, on the right, but without actually reaching either. It had been necessary, in order to cover the whole front, to place General Gladden's brigade, of General Bragg's Corps, at the extreme right of this line. The artillery attached to the Corps occupied a position in its immediate rear, with cavalry protecting both flanks. Nine thousand and twenty-four men, infantry and artillery, constituted its effective strength. The second line, under General Bragg, was some five hundred yards in rear of the first, arranged in similar order. Its strength was of ten thousand seven hundred and thirty-one men, including artillery, but to the exclusion of cavalry. General Polk's Corps, of nine thousand one hundred and thirty-six men, exclusive of cavalry, held the third line, and was deployed in columns of brigade, on the left of the Pittsburg road, its front being about eight hundred yards rearwards of General Bragg's left wing. Each brigade had its own battery; and there was cavalry protecting the extreme left of this line. General Breckinridge's command, in rear of General Bragg's right wing, occupied a position somewhat similar to that of General Polk's Corps behind General Bragg's left wing, between the Pittsburg road and Lick Creek, with cavalry supporting his right flank. It consisted of seven thousand and sixty-two men, not including cavalry. Generals Polk's and Breckinridge's commands constituted the reserve, and were to be thrown forward, as exigencies required, in support of the two front lines of battle. This gave a total of thirty-five thousand nine hundred and fifty-three, infantry and artillery; to which should be added four thousand three hundred and eighty-two cavalry; making an aggregate, of all arms, of forty thousand three hundred and thirty-five men. The cavalry, it must be said, notwithstanding the good element it was made of, could only be used for such outpost duty as involved no skirmishing.

We had pickets far in advance of our first line of battle, but nowhere could those of the enemy be seen; as if his lines were not guarded by outposts of any kind. Such, however, was not the case, as we discovered next morning.

As encamped, so near our forces, the Federals, on that day, occupied a position forming "a continuous line from Lick Creek, on the left, to Owl Creek, a branch of Snake Creek, on the right,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

facing nearly south, and possibly a little west."* Their first line was held by Generals Sherman's and Prentiss's Divisions, extending from the bridge on Owl Creek to the Lick Creek Ford. General Sherman's first brigade formed the extreme right; his fourth was west of the Shiloh Meeting-House and rested on it; his third brigade was east of the Meeting-House and also rested on it. Then began the line of General Prentiss's Division; and afterwards, at a long interval, was posted General Sherman's second brigade, in close proximity to Lick Creek. Some half a mile from this line, in its rear, was McClernand's Division, between Sherman and Prentiss. Then came Smith's Division (now W. H. L. Wallace's), two miles in the rear and toward the Tennessee River. On its left laid Hurlbut's Division, on the road leading to Hamburg, a mile and a half behind Sherman's second brigade, under Stuart.

Darkness disappeared at last before the early brightness of the morning of the 6th of April. A little before 5 o'clock A.M., on that eventful Sabbath, where the purest heaven I had seen for months, was soon to witness perhaps the bloodiest and hardest fought battle of the war, General Hardee's pickets came against those of the enemy and, driving them in, met the main body of the advanced guard of Prentiss's Division, when immediately began a scattering fire between the two outposts. General Hardee, thereupon, ordered forward his entire line; and General Prentiss, hurriedly informing Wallace and Hurlbut of the attack made upon him, threw forth, first, a few regiments, and then his whole force, to resist this unexpected onslaught upon his lines. He had to give way, however, so impetuous was the shock he received, and our line, still advancing, next struck against General Sherman's pickets, which immediately fell back toward their encampment. General Sherman now called Generals McClernand, Prentiss, and Hurlbut to his assistance; and Veatch's Brigade, of Hurlbut's Division, was rapidly sent out to protect General Sherman's left. Presently the firing increased on both sides, and continued very brisk for fully half an hour, when it gradually slackened and, before seven o'clock A.M., had almost entirely died out. But our assailing line was still moving onward, and the enemy still losing ground before it.

It is singular that notwithstanding the evidence furnished by all Confederate and many Federal authorities, some northern

* General Grant's article in the "Century Magazine" of February, 1885, page 597.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

writers and northern generals persevere in the idle assertion—idle because it has been proven groundless—that the Federal forces were not taken by surprise at Shiloh on the 6th of April, 1862. I, myself, for reasons already referred to in this paper, had deemed a surprise improbable; but that it was effected is, nevertheless, a fact. I will merely say this:

On the evening of the 5th of April, our army, amounting to some forty thousand men, was within a mile and a half of the Federal encampments. We had formed our lines of battle in the woods fronting these encampments. We had remained there a whole night, using but few precautionary measures to conceal our presence. We had moved on the next morning within easy sight of the enemy, without encountering any obstacle worthy of notice. When the first encampments were taken, many Federal officers and soldiers were yet lying in bed. Bread was being baked and was taken hot from the ovens by our men. Sutlers' stores were left wide open. Whole companies ran from their quarters, without having time to take their muskets or rifles with them. Our first columns of attack entered the first Federal lines as freely and as unimpeded as if by invitation. This alone is sufficient to prove a surprise in the fullest sense of the word. But this is not all. In Van Horne's "History of the Army of the Cumberland,"* the following passage occurs:

"A variety of facts support the assumption that neither General Halleck, General Grant, nor the division commanders on the field beyond Pittsburg Landing, had the remotest expectation that the enemy would advance in offence from Corinth with full strength. General Halleck proposed to command the united armies in their advance at Corinth, and yet was not to leave his headquarters at St. Louis, Missouri, until the 7th."

On the 5th General Sherman sent this telegram to General Grant at Savannah:

. . . "I do not apprehend anything like an attack upon our position."

General Grant on the same day telegraphs General Halleck as follows:

. . . "I have scarcely the faintest idea of an attack (general) being made upon us, but will be prepared should such a thing take place. . . . It is my present intention to send them (meaning Buell's three foremost divisions) to Hamburg, some few miles above Pittsburg, when they all get here."

* Vol. I, pp. 102 et seq.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And on the same evening (April 5th) General Grant, being then at Savannah, and addressing Colonel Ammen, who commanded a brigade of Nelson's Division, Buell's Army, said:

"You cannot march through the swamps; make the troops comfortable; I will send boats for you Monday or Tuesday (7th or 8th), or some time next week. There will be no fight at Pittsburg Landing; we will have to go to Corinth, where the rebels are fortified. If they come to attack us, we can whip them, as I have more than twice as many troops as I had at Fort Donelson."*

Further evidence to the same effect can be found in "Military Operations of General Beauregard," vol. I, chap. xxii, pp. 331, et seq.

At dawn of day I had ridden to General Johnston's head-quarters, to advise with him about our respective action in the impending battle. It was agreed between us that he would lead the attack on our right, and that I would supervise the movements of the field and direct the reserves.† When the firing became heavier he mounted his horse and rode forward. This was our last meeting.

By that time the battle had fairly opened. To study its progress and follow its phases, I took the position which General Johnston had requested me to take, and which, as first in command, he should have occupied himself, near the center and in rear of our line; and, from the spot he had just left—which was called by me "Head-Quarters No. 1"—I sent instructions and orders to various portions of the field, as, in my opinion, the exigencies required. Thus, at 7:30 A. M., I ordered Generals Polk and Breckinridge to deploy in columns of brigades, the former on the left, the latter on the right, and to be ready to move at a moment's notice, to assist either General Hardee's or General Bragg's line, or both, if it became necessary. And I freely availed myself of the services of every member of my personal and general staff all through the day, to convey messages and orders to corps commanders and others, and to keep me well informed of the precise conditions of affairs in our front.‡ Adjutant General Jordan I sent forward,

* See Col. Jacob Ammen's Diary, in "War of the Rebellion," Series I, vol. x, Part I (Reports), page 330.

† In "The Life of A. S. Johnston," p. 570, is given the following statement of Col. Jacob Thompson, formerly a volunteer A. D. C. to General Beauregard: "General Johnston determined to lead the attack in person, and leave General Beauregard to direct the movements of troops in the rear."

‡ See, in "Military Operations of General Beauregard," Appendix to vol. I, chap. xx, pages 524 et seg., reports of Colonels Brent, Ferguson, Augustin, Jacob Thompson, Major Waddell and Lieutenant A. R. Chisolm.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with instructions to inspect our lines of battle, "secure the massing of the troops for unity of attack and prompt reinforcements to weakened points; also with impressive directions to the corps commanders to mass their batteries in action, and fight them twelve guns on a point." *

To fill the space between Lick Creek and the right of General Hardee's line, Chalmers' brigade was ordered from the second line of battle and, with a battery, brought on the right of General Gladden, as prescribed by the order of march and battle. A very hot contest followed, during which General Gladden was mortally wounded, and died on the same day. His services had been invaluable; his conduct on the field worthy of the highest praise. Colonel Adams succeeded him, and, with General Chalmers, made so gallant a charge on the right, that Prentiss' whole line broke and retired in confusion. Just then came up, through a previous order of mine, Johnston's brigade, of General Polk's corps, as additional reinforcement to General Hardee's right. This being done, at about 9:30, I moved to another position, near the Pittsburg road, "about a quarter of a mile in advance of the Shiloh Meeting-House," † which was called "Head-Quarters No. 2."

The pillaging of the enemy's abandoned camps, and, therefore, the straggling of our men, had already begun. ‡ Upon being informed of the fact, I ordered members of my staff, aided by Captain Dreux, of my escort, to clear the camps thus invaded, collect the stragglers found in them, and send them on to their respective commands in front. There was much difficulty in executing these orders. This alarming feature was a source of great trouble to me, and brought back to my mind the remarks I had made at our Conference the evening previous: "Nature has claims that cannot be disregarded. The best disciplined troops do not fight well on empty stomachs. And this is all the more true of raw troops, unaccustomed to the hardships of war."

General Ruggles's command, composed of Gibson's, Anderson's and Pond's brigades, had formed on General Hardee's left, to contend with General Sherman, who had not yet been dislodged from

* Same work, vol. I, chap. xx, p. 285.

† Major Waddell's Report—"Operations of General Beauregard," vol. I, chap. xx, p. 531.

‡ Reports of members of General Beauregard's staff, in Appendix to vol. I, chap. xx of same work, pp. 527–530, 534.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his position at Shiloh, and who was striving hard to maintain it, aided by McClernand's entire division, and a regiment belonging to one of Wallace's brigades. An interval had occurred between Gibson's brigade and the two others, which was filled by the opportune arrival of one of General Polk's brigades—Russell's—ordered forward by me, some short time previous. He supported Hindman's assault upon McClernand and Veatch; and greatly contributed, with Hodgson's battery and, later on, with two sections of Ketchum's, to force General Sherman to fall back to the Purdy and Hamburg roads, and, by ten o'clock, to abandon the entire line of his camps.*

The battle now raged with renewed fury on W. H. L. Wallace's and Hurlbut's front. Colonel Adams, with Gladden's brigade, had been sent to feel the enemy's strength. At this moment, and while Adams, for want of ammunition, was unable to move forward, Breckinridge's division was led into position by Colonel Augustin, of my Staff; and Cheatham's division, which I had ordered to the same quarter, came up also, and took a stand on the left.† Both engaged the enemy at the same time and with equal impetus. But the forces under Wallace and Hurlbut showed much stubborn resistance, and did not, just then, lose their ground. They were well handled and behaved in a manner highly creditable to themselves and to their Commanders.

All the opposing forces were now engaged. Our front line had been extended, right and left, and the troops of our second line, and those composing the reserve, occupied it at different intervening points. General Johnston, changing his position in rear of Withers's division, came over, at about eleven o'clock, to the rear of Breckinridge's Division. A little before this, by agreement between Generals Bragg and Polk, the former took his stand near the right center of our line, the latter near the left center, and General Hardee remained near the extreme left. I continued to occupy a medial position on the line, towards the rear, in order to follow the general movements of our troops, in accordance with General Johnston's desire.

Learning, at about one o'clock P.M., that the forces under Sherman and McClernand showed signs of weakness and were about to give way, I ordered General Hardee to push on the cav-

*Col. Buckland's Report, Rebellion Record, Vol. IV., p, 372.
†General Cheatham's Report.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

alry against their retreating regiments, and to endeavor to cut them off from their line of encampment. This was done with great dash, and General (then Captain) Morgan, gave proof, on that occasion, of what could be expected of him in the future. By my order, another vigorous assault was made by General Hardee, upon Sherman's and McClernand's commands, which were rapidly driven back, the larger portion of them toward Snake Creek, and the other in the direction of Wallace's camps. My Head-quarters had again been advanced by this time, and were now beyond General Wallace's captured camps.*

The Confederate left was next engaged with General Wallace's division, now become the advanced Federal right, which had resolutely held its own and repulsed all assaults made upon it. General Bragg had spent more than three hours in a stubborn yet powerless endeavor to force it to give way. There was Gibson's brigade repulsed, after making four unavailing assaults, insisted upon by General Bragg, who now passed further to the right, leaving the responsibility of this portion of the field to a Staff Officer, with authority to act in his name.† General Johnston had been, for nearly three-quarters of an hour, in rear of General Breckinridge's division, which was, at that time, the advanced right of the main Confederate line. The firing was unusually heavy in that quarter; and General Johnston was astonished at the resolute resistance encountered there. After causing General Breckinridge to "appeal to the soldiers," and after doing so himself,‡ he ordered a charge, which he led, in person, with his well known valor, and during which he was wounded in the leg, without at first realizing the extent of his injury. The Federal line thus charged had slowly and reluctantly given way, retiring to the next ridge beyond; but the temporary advantage we had gained was dearly bought by the death of the General-in-Chief, a gallant soldier and noble citizen, whose life, had it been spared, would have been of inestimable value to his country. General Johnston died in the arms of Governor Harris, of Tennessee, one of his volunteer aids, at about 2.30 o'clock P.M.

* Major Waddel's Report, in "Military Operations of General Beauregard," Vol. I., Appendix to chap. xx., p. 531.

† General Bragg's Report. "Rebellion Record," Vol. X., Chap. XXII., p. 466.

‡ Col. W. P. Johnston's article in the "Century Magazine" of Fe[illegible] 1885.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Immediately after General Johnston had been wounded, and before being apprised of it, Ajutant-General Jordan, who had just arrived in that quarter of the field and had found General Breckinringe's division not in action, ordered it, in General Johnston's name, to charge the Federal forces in its front, which were screened by a fence at the entrance of a wood. The movement was successfully effected, after a hard struggle on both sides, and the enemy at last fell back, abandoning the position he had held.

Meanwhile, my attention being turned to that portion of our line near the center, where General Bragg had vainly endeavored to dislodge the enemy about an hour before, I ordered General Hardee to gather what force he could dispose of, for another advance in that quarter. I was not yet aware of the death of General Johnston. General Hardee obeyed, and sent forward the remnants of Anderson's and Gibson's brigades, with two batteries of artillery, and several battalions organized as such by members of my Staff, who had collected them from stragglers, and commands which had lost their proper positions in line. Colonel Smith's Crescent Regiment, of New Orleans, was added to these troops; and, as it passed me to join in the movement, was urged on by me with the following words: "Go forward, men, and drive them into the Tennessee!" A serious and well disputed contest ensued. The enemy finally yielded, losing ground more and more. But Prentiss and Hurlbut, further to the right, were still successful in their resistance to the forces under Breckinridge and Cheatham. Jackson's and Chalmers' commands were called, and came to their assistance, under a raking fire from Lanman's brigade. I was, at that time, in advance of McClernand's camps, directing operations at that point. There it was that, shortly after three o'clock P.M., Governor Harris came up and informed me of General Johnston's death.* However deeply grieved I was at this distressing news, the struggle just then was too hot and the result as yet too undecided, to allow me either time or opportunity to express all my regret. Messengers were hurriedly sent by me to the Corps Commanders, to inform them of what had occurred, and to urge upon them the necessity of concealing the fact from the troops; and, feeling all the more the weighty responsibility resting upon me, I gave orders that the attack be continued and pushed forward with the utmost vigor.

* Col. Wickliffe, of Gen. Johnston's Staff, brought the same news. I cannot now say whether he came before or after Governor Harris.—G. T. B.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is but true to state here, that never from the opening of the battle up to the hour of his death, had General Johnston occupied on the field the position which was properly his own, as Commander-in-Chief of our forces. From the place he had himself selected on our line, and where he remained to the last, he was but acting the part of a Corps or Division Commander, and as such, uselessly exposing his person. From where he was, he could not—nor in fact did he ever attempt to—direct the general movements of our forces. That most important trust devolved upon me, the second in command, and I performed it throughout the whole day, before, as well as after, the death of General Johnston.

What troops remained of Hindman's and Gladden's brigades, with the forces under Breckinridge and Cheatham, were now pressing Wallace's left. General Bragg was hotly assailing Prentiss's and Hurlbut's commands. Jackson and Chalmers were engaged with Hurlbut's front and left flank. Hurlbut now fell back, and the course he followed allowed Jackson and Chalmers to strike in flank the line held by Prentiss and Wallace. The space occupied by the two latter was being narrowed, more and more, around them. At that time, General Hardee, on the left, was confronting the remnants of McClernand's and Sherman's commands. Here also, and in spite of the resistance shown, the enemy was gradually falling back, in conformity with the retreating movements of the other Federal forces. Wallace was now mortally wounded. He died that day. The Federals lost in him one of their ablest and most gallant commanders. Prentiss alone, it appears, did not follow in time the rearward movement of Wallace's division. He was not warned in season and clung to his position, until surrounded from all sides, he was compelled to surrender, with all that was left of his command, an aggregate of some 2,500 men, and among them General Prentiss himself. This took place at 5.30 o'clock P.M., about three hours after General Johnston's death.

The continuous fighting, marching, countermarching and manœuvring of the troops all day long—and that mostly without food—finally produced the most telling effect upon them. Almost every position of the enemy was carried. His lines of encampments were taken. The Tennessee River was in sight, on several points of our line. We had captured small arms, guns, flags, and upwards of three thousand prisoners; but the victory, none the less, was not wholly ours. It was far from being gained when General

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Johnston fell; it was not completely gained in spite of all that was accomplished after his death. Straggling among the men, which had begun before noon, had now assumed fearful proportions. And worse even than straggling, was the fact that the men in front, who had never been out of action, were absolutely outdone by the need of food and by fatigue. To deny this is either to confess utter ignorance of what took place on the battle field of Shiloh, or to show wanton intent to subvert the truth.

Notwithstanding this state of things, I determined to again deploy our forces into line for a concerted onslaught, before it were too late, and did my utmost, with the assistance of the corps commanders, to successfully carry it out. The attack was made; but it was desultory, without spirit or ardor, and failed in effect.

There was an additional reason for our failure in this last advance upon the enemy; it was the massing of Colonel Webster's "reserve artilery," consisting of some sixty guns (among them several 24-pounder siege guns), which had been placed along a ridge overlooking Pittsburg Landing, and were powerfully assisted by the two gunboats "Tyler" and "Lexington." Supported by the remnants of Wallace's, McClernand's, and Hurlbut's divisions, and by Colonel Ammen's brigade, of Nelson's division (Buell's army), which had arrived on the field a little after 5 o'clock P. M., these guns and gunboats enfiladed the limited stretch of broken and thickly wooded ground over which our troops had to pass in their assault, and did much to impair the success of their efforts.*

It was 6 o'clock P. M., just before sunset, when I ordered the cessation of hostilities, so that our forces could be withdrawn for rest, and thus avoid confusion in their rearward march. But, before that order was received by the corps commanders—and in many cases before it was issued—the contest had already virtually ceased on the greater portion of the field. It is absolutely errone-

* . . . "We were immediately in the rear of our line, the enemy had fallen back to Pittsburg Landing, and their gunboats were keeping up a furious shelling. Our men, immediately in front of where we we were standing, were much demoralized, and indisposed to advance in the face of the shells which were bursting over us in every direction; and my impression was (this was also the conclusion of General Bragg) that our troops had done all that they would do and had better be withdrawn."—Extract from a letter written by Dr. Nott, of General Bragg's staff, to General Beauregard. See "Military Operations of General Beauregard," vol. I, Appendix to chap. xx, page 535.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ous to state that some of the subordinate commanders were preparing another concerted movement, and that it was prevented by my order to stop the fight. No one on the hard-fought field of Shiloh had the hope of victory more at heart than I had. The entire conception of the campaign had been mine; and I had directed the general movements of the troops throughout the day. But human endurance has its limits; and to quote the language of General Bragg, not as found in his Report, written more than three months after the battle of Shiloh, but as used by him while leaving the front on the 6th of April with his exhausted men:

"They had done all that they would do and had better be withdrawn." *

It was dusk when the troops began to leave the front to bivouac for the night. Many of them left after darkness had set in, and, on that account, got separated from their commands. General Chalmers, in his official report, says:

"Our men . . . continued to fight until night closed the hostilities on both sides. . . . They were too much exhausted to storm the batteries on the hill" . . . .

Colonel Urquhart, one of the members of General Bragg's personal staff, in a letter to General Jordan on this point, says:

When . . . "this order was given, the plain truth must be told, that our troops at the front were a thin line of exhausted men, who were making no further headway, and were glad to receive orders to fall back."

A mass of evidence, collected with care from Federal and Confederate reports, could be accumulated here to sustain what I have just stated. I refrain from lack of space.†

Later in the evening, some of the corps and division commanders visited my head-quarters, established in what had been one of General Sherman's tents, near the Shiloh Meeting-House. General Bragg was among them. They showed and expressed much satisfaction over the triumph of the day. No one intimated, directly or indirectly, within my hearing or that of my staff, that the order to cease firing and fall back to the captured camps of the enemy had been given too soon, or that it should not have been given at all. They were well aware that, though masters of the field, our vic-

* Dr. Nott's letter already quoted. The whole of it can be found in "Military Operations of General Beauregard," vol. I, Appendix to chap. xxii, page 535.

† See "Military Operations of General Beauregard," vol. I, Appendix to chap. xxii, pp. 547 et seq.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tory had been incomplete ; but acknowledged that the troops had done all that could be expected of them. The hope was entertained by all present, that, upon resuming the offensive the next day, we would complete our work, and accomplish the end we were striving for. I handed to General Bragg and to the other officers there a dispatch I had just received, to the effect that some of the divisions of Buell's army were marching toward Florence and not to Pittsburg Landing. Unfortunately this news proved to be false. The troops referred to were of Mitchell's Division, not then with Buell's army.

Having now instructed the corps commanders present, and sent orders to the others, to look to the comfort of their jaded troops and reorganize them for the next day's events, we separated for the night, and I retired to my temporary quarters to seek some rest, of which I was greatly in need.

I do not propose to give more than a cursory description of the second day's fight at Shiloh. "Monday," it has been said, "was General Beauregard's battle."* It was, unquestionably ; but not more than the battle of Sunday ; for the reason that I directed the general movements of the army on both days.

Skirmishing began early on the morning of the 7th. Gathering the forces that were at hand, Generals Hardee, Bragg, and Breckinridge hurried to the front to meet the enemy's onset. On the extreme right of our line was General Hardee, with Chalmers' and Jackson's brigades, of Bragg's Corps. General Bragg was at the left, with the remainder of his command, and Clark's Division, of Polk's Corps, and, shortly afterwards, Trabue's Kentucky brigade. General Breckinridge was on the left of General Hardee. Between the former and General Bragg was a vacant space, assigned to General Polk, who had not yet made his appearance on the field. He arrived later in the morning, to my great relief, and promptly falling into line, led his men under fire with his wonted coolness and gallantry.

On the other hand, Nelson's division, next to the river, formed the left of the enemy's front line. On his right came Crittenden ; then McCook, whose division was the extreme right of General Buell's command. General Lew Wallace, with his fresh troops

* Col. W. P. Johnston's article in the "Century Magazine" of February, 1885, page 628.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which had arrived late the evening before, was on the extreme right, near Snake Creek. The other Federal forces, gathered from the broken commands of the first day's battle,—namely, Sherman's, McClernand's and Hurlbut's—were on the center.

The first Confederate pickets that came in contact with the enemy, that morning, were from Forrest's cavalry. They retired in good order toward General Hardee's line, and sought, and found, shelter behind it. Nelson's advancing columns were soon confronted by Chalmers' brigade, with Colonel Moore's regiment, and a mixed command made up of troops from Jackson's and Gladden's brigades; added to which were the Crescent Regiment, of New Orleans, and the 26th Alabama, with batteries to support them. Nelson's forces were compelled to fall back, but, at about eight o'clock, advanced a second time, being now reinforced by Hazen's brigade. Our troops began to give way and, while doing so, lost one of their batteries. They soon rallied, however, and, at nine o'clock, again took the offensive, with the assistance of other batteries, and of reinforcements opportunely sent by me. Their first position was finally recovered, and the lost battery was theirs once more. Hazen's brigade suffered considerably in that encounter, and came very near falling into our hands. Ammen's brigade was also closely pressed, and would have been turned on its left, had it not been for the timely arrival of Terrell's battery, of McCook's Division.

After Nelson's, Crittenden's Division was engaged with General Hardee's forces and a part of General Breckinridge's. A hot contest ensued, in which, at about 10 o'clock, some of General Grant's forces, under McClernand and Hurlbut, took an active part. This whole Federal force was kept at bay, for several hours, and until two brigades of McCook's Division were sent to reinforce it. It then began to gain ground, our troops slowly giving way;—not, however, before I had resolved to retire from the field, and thus put an end to a useless loss of life and material.

It was evident that General Buell's arrival, with three divisions of his army, was an accomplished fact; and that my depleted forces were now confronting some twenty thousand fresh troops, exclusive of Lew Wallace's Division, aggregating about seven thousand men, and exclusive also of what remained of General Grant's troops of the day before, which amounted to not less than twenty thousand men;—though it is doubtful whether much

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more than half that number actively participated in the battle of Monday. Deducting our losses of the previous day, and the stragglers, amounting to thousands, I never had, ready for duty, and with musket in hand, on the 7th of April, more than twenty thousand men—and at one o'clock P.M., not even sixteen thousand, exclusive of cavalry; which, owing to the nature of the ground, and as General Grant himself admitted, "could not be used in front."*

Our left had been seriously threatened, at about one o'clock P.M. General Bragg's forces at that point, weakened by the withdrawal of three brigades to reinforce our right and center, were closely pressed and unable any longer to hold their ground. He called on me for aid. I ordered the 18th Louisiana and the Orleans Guard Battalion—now blended into one command—and remnants of an Alabama and a Tennessee regiment to be immediately sent to him, and, going on with them as they passed, led them myself in the charge. General Bragg thereupon resumed the offensive, and the enemy fell back some distance beyond the Shiloh Meeting-House. I had established my head-quarters, early in the morning, at that central point of our lines, where I remained, undisturbed, until nearly 2.30 o'clock P. M.

All the Confederate troops confronting, on the 7th of April, the forty thousand Federals arrayed against them—about twenty-seven thousand of whom were composed of fresh troops—had fought hard, from early dawn to late in the the evening of Sunday. Exhausted as they were, they fought again on the 7th, with such spirit and endurance, as to justify me in saying of them in my preliminary report to the War Department: "From the outset our troops, notwithstanding our fatigue and losses from the battle of the day before, exhibited the most cheering, veteran-like steadiness."

There was now but one course to pursue. It was, while inducing the enemy to believe in a determination on my part to continue the contest, to quietly prepare for a timely and honorable retreat. I acted with much caution and abstained from communicating my intention to the corps commanders and, even, at first, to my Chief of Staff. Since nine o'clock in the morning, however, I had sent messengers to Corinth, to inquire as to the arrival of General Van

* General Grant's article in "Century Magazine" of February, 1885, page 600.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dorn. I knew it was problematical, but was loath to begin any retrograde movement, before that last hope of relief had failed me. Meanwhile I caused reinforcements, made up of stragglers and disjointed commands gathered from the rear, to be hastened to the front, as fast as they could be found; and, strange though it may seem, these became the only *reserves* I could dispose of to strengthen my thinned ranks, and with which the unequal contest then going on was prolonged for more than four hours, with no sign of decisive advantage on the part of the enemy.

When, at last the news was brought back that Van Dorn and his forces had not arrived, and that not even his whereabouts could be ascertained, I began seriously the difficult work before me; difficult, because it had to be done without weakness or hesitancy, so as neither to make it appear a defeat in the eye of the enemy, nor a cause of discouragement to our overwrought troops. I despatched an aid to the rear, with a squadron of cavalry, for the purpose of clearing and preparing the roads for the passage of the army. I also instructed Adjutant-General Jordan to select, at once, a convenient spot across the first ravine, toward the rear, and there to station infantry and artillery, to protect our line of march, as the troops would be leaving the field. The corps commanders were then made aware of my plan; and, while taking the necessary measures to carry it out, were ordered to resume the offensive on divers points of the line, with a view to keep our adversary in ignorance of the true motive of our movement. They very ably executed the orders given them; and the retreat was begun by 2.30 P. M. and effected leisurely, quietly, and with much regularity.

General Breckinridge's command was the first to retire; the troops, right and left of his position, closing up the space it had just occupied. It was marched to the rear of the force collected by Colonel Jordan, and there halted, as agreed upon, to act as a rear guard. General Polk's corp came next; then General Hardee's; and lastly, General Bragg's. There was no flurry, no useless haste, among men or officers; and even the stragglers dropped into line and rejoined their commands as they passed. No pursuit whatsoever was attempted by the enemy. In fact, the Federal troops that had fought the day before were as much outdone as our own. Generals Grant and Sherman acknowledge it in their reports. The former even stated, later on, and caused it to be published, that, though desirous of pursuing the retreating army,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he "had not the heart to order it to men who had fought desperately for two days, lying in mud and rain, whenever not fighting." * Such was not the case, however, with the three divisions of General Buell's army. These were made up of fresh troops, though it is well to state that they had done most, if not all, of the fighting on Monday. But no order to pursue was given to General Buell. General Grant seems to have been diffident about it, and had not yet acquired the habit of giving orders to General Buell. †

General Breckinridge, in command of the rear guard, bivouacked on the night of the 7th at a distance of not more than a mile and a half from the battle-field. No hostile force of any kind, not the crack of a rifle, nor the sound of a bugle, disturbed his rest. On the morning of the 8th he moved his force three miles further to the rear, and remained in that position for several days without being attacked or even annoyed in any manner whatever.

General Sherman, however, on the lower Corinth road, and General Wood (of Buell's army), on the upper road, with two brigades each, did venture on a reconnoissance on the morning of the 8th, which was far from being a success. They came across our cavalry pickets, posted where General Breckinridge had bivouacked the previous night, and, being in such number, easily drove them back, sending two regiments, one of infantry and one of cavalry, to press them further rearward, and capture them, if possible. It so happened that the pursuers struck against Colonel Forrest, with a fraction of his own cavalry and a few companies under Captain Morgan, in all, three hundred and fifty men. The Federal raiders fell back in the greatest hurry, leaving on the ground some fifteen men killed, and twenty-five wounded. But Colonel Forrest followed them too far, and finally met the four reconnoitering brigades which barred his way and forced him to fall back. Colonel Forrest was very seriously wounded on that occasion, and had to leave the service for more than two months.

Our loss on both days was heavy; but it must be borne in mind that we were the assailants during the whole of Sunday, and also, very frequently on Monday. The list of casualties stood as follows:

Killed	1,728
Wounded	8,012
Missing	959
In all	10,699

* "Century Magazine" of February, 1885, page 605. † Idem, page 605.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or an average "of twenty-four and one-third per cent. of those present on the field."

We carried back with us some twenty-six stands of colors, and about thirty pieces of artillery, leaving behind many more, for lack of horses to remove them to the rear. We took, besides, a large number of small arms, and, as before stated, more than three thousand prisoners.

Our forces, with the exception of Breckinridge's and Chalmers' commands, resumed the positions they occupied at Corinth on the 3d of April. The work of recruitment and reorganization was immediately begun. I applied to the War Department for two major-generals, four brigadier-generals, and a chief of artillery. I also recommended General Bragg for promotion.

During the comparative lull that followed, I was desirous of preparing a correct, final report of the battle of Shiloh, and of substituting it to the hastily written—and in many respects imperfect—preliminary report I had forwarded to Richmond. This, however, I was debarred from doing, as none of the corps commanders were ready with their own reports. These, in fact, were only prepared months after the events they described; General Polk's not until nearly one year after; General Bragg's, though apparently written on the 30th of April, was not completed before the 25th of July; that is, more than three months after the battle.* Contrary to all military usage, these reports were sent direct to the War Department, instead of being forwarded through me. Hence the errors, discrepancies and misinterpretations to be found in certain portions of them. They are not sustained by actual facts, nor by what was stated in the official reports of brigade and regiment commanders, upon which they purported to have been based.

On the 11th of April General Van Dorn's forces arrived at Memphis. I sent General Rust's brigade to Fort Pillow, and General Little's to Rienzi, some twelve miles from Corinth, for the purpose of reconnoitering, and also of selecting a good defensive position for a retrograde movement, in case of need.

Shortly after the battle of Shiloh, General Halleck took command of the Federal forces at Pittsburg Landing. They soon began to increase by the arrival of reinforcements, and, later on, of General Pope's army, estimated at twenty-five thousand men.

* I have never been able to procure that of General Breckinridge.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

General Halleck must have had, then, under him, at least one hundred and twenty-five thousand men of all arms. Whereas the Confederate forces, under me, including Van Dorn's seventeen thousand men, numbered not more than fifty thousand; "daily decreasing on account of sickness," and with no hope of being reinforced.

When General Van Dorn reached Corinth, he was assigned to a position on the south side of the Memphis and Charleston Railroad, on the right and in rear of our defensive lines. These extended some three miles in advance of the town, on high grounds in rear of a creek, and had been established by General Bragg, while I was still at Jackson. They were defective, especially toward the left. I corrected them afterward, but not to the extent I would have wished.

"General Hardee's corps extended along and from the Memphis and Charleston Railroad, in front of General Van Dorn's position, to the left, where it rested on the right of General Bragg, whose left in turn rested on the right of General Polk's corps, stretching across the Mobile and Ohio Railroad. The left of this command occupied some woods protected by abattis and rifle-pits, each corps holding a few brigades in reserve." *

Directly behind Corinth was General Breckinridge's command, which now, as before the battle of Shiloh, constituted the reserve.

Sickness among the troops began to be so prevalent that the eventuality of a change of strategic position, to insure the health and safety of the army, soon forced itself upon me. Such a position was not easy to find; for, while from it the enemy had to be held in check, and the country in his rear protected, including Fort Pillow, a salubrious locality and a supply of good water, so much needed at Corinth, had also to be taken into serious consideration. Grand Junction, on that account, had been discarded. But the fear of losing Fort Pillow, which was still so essential to the safety of Vicksburg, around which, by my orders, defensive works were already in process of construction, caused me, for the time being, to waive all thought of a change, until compelled to revert to it anew, by the mode of approach of the enemy in my front.

It was hard to say just when my position would be seriously

* "Military Operations of General Beauregard," Vol. 1, Chap. xxiv., p. 382.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

threatened by the advance of General Halleck upon it. That he was closing in upon Corinth, more and more, every day, was an undoubted fact; but so extremely cautious were all his movements, that one less acquainted with our respective strength might have supposed he commanded my force of fifty thousand men, and I his large army of one hundred and twenty-five thousand. Nevertheless, I dispatched several officers of trust with special instructions to look for and report upon, a good defensive position, healthy in every respect, and where an abundance of water could readily be procured. Tupelo was the place finally designated and recommended.

On the 8th of May, General Pope, whose line of encampments was near Hamburg, on the Tennessee, advanced with his entire force on Farmington, a small village, four miles from Corinth. He had undertaken this aggressive movement, it was believed, without consultation with General Halleck. Between him and General Buell, ran Seven Miles Creek, now filled by recent rains, and which completely separated him from his base. Seizing upon this opportunity, and desirous of cutting off his line of retreat, I ordered a concerted attack in full force upon his position. It was only partially successful, and failed through the inefficiency of General Van Dorn's guide, and the tardiness of one of his division commanders. As it was, however, two of General Pope's brigades barely escaped falling into our hands. Their casualities, in killed and wounded, were heavy. They also lost a large number of small arms and accoutrements.

I prepared, a few days later, another concerted movement somewhat similar to the one just mentioned, and for the same purpose; but a series of rain storms baffled the attempt, and the troops were ordered back to their former positions. This was on the 18th of May. General Halleck was still advancing upon us, slowly but safely, and the effectiveness of our troops was daily decreasing owing to the prevalence of disease among them.

It was now clear to me that the withdrawal of the army from Corinth should no longer be delayed. That by so doing we would lose a strategic point of the greatest value, none appreciated more than I did; but there could be no hesitation between the holding of Corinth and the safety of our forces. I called the corps commanders together, and, after fully expressing my views to them, asked that each should give his individual opinion upon the impor-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tant question under advisement. The conclusion arrived at was unanimous: the evacuation of Corinth was a military necessity.

Orders were immediately given for the removal to Baldwin, Tupelo, and other localities in the rear, of the heavy guns, ammunition, camp equipage and also of the sick. Very minute instructions were given by me to the corps commanders. They were enjoined not to speak of the projected movement; but to spread the rumor that we were preparing for a general engagement.

The evacuation began on the 30th of May, at one o'clock A. M. The main obstacles in the way had been removed; all the wagon-trains and all the rearmost troops were sent on ahead.

In order to impress the enemy with the belief that we were about to take the offensive and were receiving reinforcements, I caused empty trains to be run at stated times, during the night, and ordered the troops stationed near them to cheer vociferously as they arrived. The effect desired was produced, as is shown by the following telegram of General Pope to General Halleck:

"The enemy are reinforcing in my front and left. The cars are running constantly, and the cheering is immense every time they unload in front of me. I have no doubt, from all appearances, that I shall be attacked in heavy force at daylight."

It is an undisputed fact that our last files were quietly marching out of Corinth when the above was forwarded. A thin line of skirmishers and some few cavalry had been left to keep up appearances.

It was only in the morning of the 30th, long after dawn, that the enemy, who had made vast preparations to meet the anticipated attack, at last discovered the entire withdrawal of the Confederate Army from Corinth.

The retreat was orderly, in every respect, and was effected as it had been planned. An army of fifty thousand men disappeared from the immediate front of an army of one hundred and twenty-five thousand, and brought away with it its munitions of war, its stores, its sick; and suffered no material loss of any kind. No pursuit was attempted by General Halleck. It is even doubtful whether he was aware of the direction taken by our forces, on their line of retreat. That line was, from Corinth to Rienzi, Booneville, Baldwin and, finally, to Tupelo (fifty miles south), which latter place was reached on the 9th of June. I had caused several halts to be made on the march; the first, six miles from Corinth, behind the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Tuscumbia River; the second, at Rienzi, and the third at Baldwin, to be ready to meet the enemy had he shown any willingness to follow; but he did not.

The evacuation of Corinth, if not an absolute Confederate victory, was unquestionably a barren triumph for the Federals. Such was, at the time, the conclusion reached by all unbiased minds. Such is the verdict of history to-day. It saved the army from incalculable disasters. It foiled the plans and preparations of the enemy, and prolonged the contest in the South-west for more than a year.

G. T. BEAUREGARD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ENGLAND AND IRELAND.

Now that the impossibility of longer continuing to treat Ireland as a conquered province is becoming apparent, the true nature of the Irish question is beginning to make itself clear. The difficulty British statesmen find in agreeing to any measure of self-government that would satisfy the demands of the Irish people is as to what would become of the Irish landlords.

Americans generally have regarded the difficulty between Ireland and England as essentially political, for that is the phase of which they have heard most. But the truth is, that, beneath the political question, lies the social question. The long and cruel misgovernment of Ireland has not been wanton in the sense of having been without motive. From the landing of Strongbow to the suspension of jury trial, English outrage and oppression in Ireland have been prompted by the desire of greedy adventurers to obtain possession of Irish soil, or of their descendants and successors to keep possession. This has been the motive of massacres and proscriptions, of religious persecutions and penal laws, of castle government and coercion acts. It is for this that the Royal Irish Constabulary is maintained and that Ireland is garrisoned by English troops.

It is true that the miserable vanity that so often passes for patriotism, and race prejudice and religious bigotry have been utilized to the utmost in securing British support of this class government of Ireland, just as such feelings were utilized in popularizing wars undertaken to maintain the right divine of kings. The magic of the possessive pronoun, which enables paupers and serfs to glory in the greatness of "*our* country," has made down-trodden Englishmen ready to tread down Irishmen just as, a century ago, they were ready to war against the liberties of their kinsmen in America, to put down a revolt in "*our* colonies." The English laborer, driven by the deprivation of his birthright to deem employment at starvation wages a boon, has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

learned to dread and hate the Irish laborers forced by the same cause into competition with him, just as laborers in California have learned to dread and hate the Chinese, and laborers in Pennsylvania, the Poles and Hungarians. And in the same way that vain pride of opinion—always strongest among those who have had least to do in providing themselves with opinions—which manifests itself in religious bigotry, has been powerful in closing the eyes of Englishmen to the wrongs of Ireland, and disposing them to lend their power in crushing Irish aspirations.

Yet these are but the means of which the Irish landlord interest has availed itself, not the motives of the oppression of Ireland. The purpose of that oppression has been to enable the landlord to extort his rents, and to shield the "exterminator" from that wild justice which, whether called by the name of "Captain Moonlight" or "Judge Lynch," always springs up when legal justice is denied.

Irish landlordism is not merely a British interest in the sense that its spoils are largely drawn to Great Britain by Irish landlords residing there, or to pay interest on mortgages held by British capitalists—but it is part and parcel of the system which enables the dominant class in Great Britain to live in idleness on the labor of their own countrymen, and they have the same direct concern in maintaining Irish landlordism as the slave-holders of South Carolina would have had in preventing a successful insurrection of slaves in North Carolina.

That Irish landlordism, to maintain itself, has had to rely upon British power, and to resort to measures of repression that British landlords have not found necessary, is due, not to any difference in its nature, but partly to differences in historical development, and partly to differences in industrial development. Ireland was never conquered by the Romans; it attained under the Celtic institutions a comparatively high degree of civilization; instead of succumbing to Norman invaders, they were so assimilated that they became "more Irish than the Irish themselves," nor did final subjugation take place until the Reformation had brought about a distinction of religion between conquerors and conquered. This, being seized upon by the spoliators as the most convenient and certain designation under which the despoiled could be prevented from regaining power, had the effect of keeping the Irish priest close to the peasant and of preventing religion from being used, as it has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

elsewhere been used, to destroy the idea of natural rights. Thus the spirit and traditions of the people have been better preserved, and the Irish peasant, hard as may have been his lot, has never been so completely crushed as the corresponding class in Great Britain. Ireland is not only at an earlier point of historical development than England, since for English parallels of struggles which are in Ireland matters of yesterday and to-day, we must go back to the times of Robin Hood, to those popular risings as to which tradition is silent and history gives us only imperfect glimpses, and to the clearances and hangings that went on under the Tudors—but it is also at an earlier point of industrial development. Being in the main an agricultural country, and the organization of agriculture being yet in large part so simple that the laborer is the direct tenant of the landlord, the relations that must always exist between land and labor are not obscured in the popular mind by the capitalistic intermediary.

The national feeling that has done so much to keep alive the spirit of the Irish people is of course political in its primary aims. But the present Irish movement is far more than a movement having for its object the restoration to the Irish people of such rights of self-government as are enjoyed by the American people. And it is from this fact that it derives its strength.

The Home Rule movement of Isaac Butt was a political movement from what may be called the aristocratic side. The Fenian movement was a political movement from the democratic side. But neither the one, nor yet even the other, aroused the strength which the Land League movement has shown. The reason is that this movement is essentially a social movement. It not only appeals as directly to the humblest of the disinherited as did the agitation of O'Connell for the repeal of religious disabilities, but even more powerfully, for it appeals to what the English press calls the "cupidity" of the Irish peasant—that is to say to his indisposition to be robbed of his hard earnings, to be despoiled of the food without which wife and children must starve or go to the poorhouse. It not only promises to give him political rights, but a right far more important—the right to live.

The two currents which unite in the Irish revolt are well represented in its two foremost leaders. Charles Stewart Parnell is a landlord of the "English Pale," educated in one of the great educational centers of the British aristocracy, belonging by birth to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that privileged circle in which it was, until recent years, alone possible to look forward to a political career, and with the personal tastes and feelings of the dominant class. His character and powers are those of the typical Englishman rather than the typical Irishman. He is an astute politician,* and in disciplining and handling his forces, and in mastering difficult situations has shown qualities of the highest order. But, though raised to power on the crest of the Land League movement, he represents its political, not its social aim. Though he has been led at times into radical utterances on the land question, and was induced to sign the no-rent manifesto, his own policy is evidently the conservation rather than the destruction of landlordism; and his ideas of agrarian reform go no further than reductions of rents and the purchase by tenants of their holdings. While he might go upon social questions as far as the most radical, it would be as forced by the current, not as leading and urging it on.

Michael Davitt, on the other hand, is by birth a Mayo peasant who learned to lisp in Gallic, a typical representative of the race who, swept from their lands "to Connaught or to hell," have preserved among the bogs and rocks of the west the traditions of a freer life. Carried to England by an evicted mother, who begged her way from door to door rather than suffer the degradation of the poor-house, his school was an English factory where, while yet a child, his right arm was torn from his shoulder, and his university the English penal prison to which his love for his country and his desire to win her political independence consigned him. With all the warm and generous qualities of the typical Irishman he has also the impulsiveness that is associated with them. With great "magnetism" and capacity as a popular organizer, he is a born leader of men, but his leadership is rather that of the Irish chief who headed the wild charge than that of the cautious tactician who moves his forces with the coolness of a chess player. With the self-abnegation that has led him to refuse all testimonials and pecuniary rewards, he has suffered those who were fighting its Parliamentary battle to assume the management and direction of the movement which he began. But he has the strength of the man who stands for a great principle, who, as Emerson phrased it, has "hitched his wagon to a star." What he represents is more than the desire for mere political freedom. It is the aspira-

* I use the word of course in its original sense.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion for that full freedom that can only be secured where every human creature has an equal right to the land on which and from which all must live.

And this is the core of the Irish movement. The political struggle that goes on in the British Parliament is but a part of the social struggle which is going on all over Ireland—that passive war that has for its inevitable end the restoration to the Irish people of their natural rights in their native soil.

It is a mistake to suppose that the idea that land should be treated as the common property of the whole people involves anything new or strange to the Irish mind. Four years ago, when I first visited in Ireland, I received a request from one of the most venerable and best loved of the Irish bishops that I should visit him, as he wished to have a long talk with me. I went, and he put to me, one after another, all the arguments that are usually made for private property in land, and all the objections that are usually urged to its treatment as the property of the community. I answered his questions, and met his objections, till finally, his face lighting up, he exclaimed: "God bless you, my son! I have been questioning you, because I wanted to see if you could defend your faith. You have been expressing my firm convictions. And though it may not seem so yet, no human power can stop the movement that has begun in Ireland short of what you contend for. Nor in what you say to me, is there anything new. It is the same doctrine, that, when a little boy sitting in the evening by the turf fire, I have heard from the lips of old men who could not speak an English word. Our people have bowed to might, but they have never forgotten their national rights. Where the Irish tongue is spoken you will find what you are saying understood."

And so I found it. "What is he saying?" I have asked on wind-swept hillsides of the Hebrides, as the crowd of crofters and fishermen swayed with answering emotion to the burst of Gallic oratory. "He is saying what you say," would come the reply. "He is saying that all men have the same right to land, and that this is what our fathers have always said; and he is repeating from the old poetry and from the Bible, that God made the land for all His children, and that He is no respecter of persons."

It was among Irishmen, who have preserved the old traditions, that the Land League movement had its inception. Patrick Ford, to whom more than any other Irish-American, it owes the support

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that enabled it to gather strength, has from the first proclaimed the truth that the rights of men to land are equal, and scouted the idea of any truce or compromise with landlordism. Michael Davitt, who founded the Land League, raised at the first the standard of "the Land for the People," and has never faltered.

Nor does the truth that human rights to the use of land are equal and unalienable lack in the Irish mind the force of a religious truth. These are the words of Dr. Nulty, Bishop of Meath, in a pastoral letter to the clergy and laity of his diocese five years ago :

> "The land, therefore, of every country, is the *common property* of the people of that country ; because its real Owner—the Creator who made it—has transferred it as a voluntary gift to them. 'The earth He hath given to the children of men.' Now, as every individual in every country is a creature and a child of God, and as all His creatures are equal in His sight, any settlement of the land of this or any other country that would exclude the humblest man in this or that country from his share of the common inheritance would not only be an injustice and a wrong to that man, but would, moreover, be an impious resistance to the benevolent intentions of his Creator."

At nothing short of the acknowledgment of this equal right can the Irish movement stop.

The political element in the Irish movement is, of course, the largest, since it includes all who desire more than political rights, as well as those who desire only political rights ; but the social element is the more intense, and it must come to the front just in proportion as political demands are satisfied. This is the dilemma in which the governing class of Great Britain find themselves. Something must be granted to the Irish determination to secure self-government ; but the more that is conceded, the more will the agitation of the land question increase, and the less will be the power of resisting it.

If "Grattan's Parliament," as it really was, could satisfy Irish demands to-day, there is no question that the dominant class in Great Britain will be willing enough to see it instituted. But Grattan's Parliament—a corrupt conclave of the ruling oligarchy, in which the masses of the people had no representation—could no more be resuscitated in Ireland to-day than slavery could be re-established in America. An Irish Parliament now must mean a parliament in which the landless, not the landlords, shall rule—a parliament which would at once address itself to the task of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

abolishing landlordism. And while nothing less than the full management of their own affairs can satisfy the Irish demand, any concession which falls short of that can only increase the power of demanding more.

The real pinch in the Irish question is seen in the frantic declarations of even such Liberal papers as the "Pall Mall Gazette" that "if the Irish will not pay their landlords twenty shillings in the pound on the fair value of their property, they must not only dispense with any hope of Home Rule, but with any semblance of goverment by consent," and by the assertions of English politicians who concede the justice of self-government, that it must be accompanied by some guarantee that the "property" of the landlords shall not be "confiscated." This is asking for the moon as the condition of agreeing to the inevitable. The Irish masses are past the point of paying anything in the pound any longer than they can help it, and there is no power that can give any such guarantee. Mr. Parnell and the Irish Parliamentary Party could not give it if they would. They may move forward with the tide, but they cannot sweep it back.

The proposition attributed to Mr. Giffen, statistician of the Board of Trade, for the buying out of the Irish landlords and the appropriation of their rents to the support of the Irish Government, is the most statesmanlike proposition which the Irish problem has yet called forth from any Englishman of influence, inasmuch as it recognizes the fact that the land question is the fundamental difficulty. It is, in brief, that the British Government shall buy out the Irish agricultural landlords, or rather, such of them as have been affected by the last Land Act, by giving them three per cent. consols at the rate of twenty years' purchase of the judicial rents, which would amount to about £160,000,000, or $800,000,000; the land so ransomed to be made over to the present tenants, on condition that they pay to the local Government of Ireland one-half or one-third of the judicial rents.

This scheme offers the Irish landlords full compensation for what they have been accustomed to consider their property; to the tenants a large reduction of rent, and to the Irish people a considerable permanent revenue. The parties who would be "out" on this transaction are the imperial tax-payers of the three kingdoms. Yet on Mr. Giffen's theory that such a plan would settle the Irish land question, they would not only be saved large expendi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tures now necessary to make in Ireland, while the difficulty in the way of permitting the Irish people to manage their own home affairs would be removed. The presentation of such a scheme is gratifying evidence of the rapid progress of British thought toward the only basis on which the land question can be permanently settled, but even if it could be adopted it could not settle the Irish land question. It would only affect a portion of Irish land, and as to that, would not recognize the equality of rights, merely carving up, with some deduction, the estates of the landlords among the tenants, but leaving out the laborers and all other classes. It is, in short, a heroic plan of doing, at the expense of the imperial tax-payer, and with some concession to the principle of land nationalization, what it has been vainly attempted to do by loan of public funds—save the Irish landlords, and interest a much larger number of the people in the further maintenance of landlordism.

Five years ago, a proposal of this kind would have seemed to the English mind too radical to have been dreamed of. But in these five years the world, and especially the English-speaking world, has been moving much faster than many people realize. Not only has the Irish movement passed the point when any such compromise could satisfy it, but the same spirit is awake in England, in Scotland, and in Wales. This is what places British landlordism "between the devil and the deep sea," making it dangerous for it to stand and dangerous for it to try to compromise.

Even the discussion of such a proposition for the settlement of the Irish land question would of itself suffice—if that were needed—to bring the British land question within the sphere of practical politics. If the Imperial tax-payer is to buy out the Irish landlords for the benefit of the Irish tenant, what about the Scottish crofters? What about the newly enfranchised British agricultural laborer, who already has his representatives in the House of Commons, so long sacred to his betters? What about the crowded slums of British cities and the thousands upon thousands of unemployed workingmen? Why not buy out the landlords of the three kingdoms?

Why not? The answer will be quick and certain. When it is proposed that the living people of a country shall buy their country from the heirs and assignees of certain dead men, the absurdity and injustice of private property in land must strike the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

most obtuse. For it is, as Thomas Jefferson said, a self-evident truth that the earth belongs in usufruct to the living, and that no right of ownership in it can be derived from the dead. No matter how habit may blind men to it, it must appear self-evident, whenever they come to think of it, that the equal right to life involves the equal right to land.

From whatever cause, the policy of the Irish Parliamentarians up to this time has been such as to repel rather than to attract the co-operation of the British democracy. While in the recent election the Presbyterians of Argyllshire, despite the injunctions of their ministers, returned an Irish Catholic, solely because of his views on the land question, the Irish vote of Glasgow was, by Mr. Parnell's order, thrown against the candidates of the Scottish Land Restoration League, with the result, in one case, of electing an Irish landlord, most virulently opposed to the Irish movement.

But, sooner or later, common aims must unite the masses. The Irish question cannot be settled without the settlement of the land question on both sides of St. George's Channel. Nor can its influence be unfelt across a wider sea. In the right to do as he pleases with his own—in the right to say who shall or who shall not live upon and use his land the American land owner has all the legal rights that the most tyrannical Irish landlord ever exercised. If they do not yet give him the same power over men it is simply that our population is still sparse, and that the competition of the disinherited for the use of the natural element necessary to life and labor is not therefore so intense. But how these powers are being brought out may be seen from the steady rise in the value of land, which means simply that the American laborer must pay more to the American land owner for the privilege of living. And how much more intense is competition, unchecked by tradition or custom, likely to be here than in Ireland may be seen from the fact that while Buckle estimates Irish rents, when about at their highest, at one-fourth of the produce, one-half the crop is already a common rent in our new States.

HENRY GEORGE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ARISTOCRATIC DRIFT OF AMERICAN PROTESTANTISM.

WHEN the English Church first reared an altar beside the James River in the little settlement which the fortune-hunters of England established with such difficulty, there were no marked differences of rank amongst the men who knelt before it. Few were there who were not of gentle birth when the colony was founded, but, some years later, when the population was less homogeneous, we may be very sure that within the sanctuary walls regard was had for him who could wear the gay clothing and the gold ring, rather than for him whose plain speech and plain garb proclaimed him simple instead of gentle. The men who founded Boston and Plymouth were of a different stamp from their Virginian brethren. Sturdy, hard-headed men of the middle class, one might have expected that in the temples which they should build, no artificial distinctions of rank would be allowed. Yet very soon we find them, in their rude meeting-houses, exalting the Christian who possessed two cloaks and had everything handsome about him, so far as was possible under existing circumstances, above the Christian who did not possess extraneous advantages. A few years later we find a similar state of affairs among the Dutch worshipers at New Amsterdam, the gay clothing and the gold ring once more being rewarded with chief seats in the synagogues.

Two hundred and fifty years have gone by, and the world has made more progress in that time, we are told, than in many cycles of Cathay. Year by year Protestantism has eliminated one harsh feature after another from its statements of belief, and has adapted itself more and more nearly to the needs of humanity, it is claimed. The rude meeting-houses of the colonial period have given place to costly churches, it is true. Inside of these temples the light, passing with difficulty through painted glass, reveals an interior filled with carefully upholstered seats, where the foot falls

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upon the softest carpets, and where the pealing organ swells the note of self-gratulation.

"The Lord is in His holy temple," says the clergyman, "let all the earth keep silence before Him." But is "all the earth" present, in this house of the Lord's? The wearers of gay clothing and gold rings seem to be in the majority here. How should it be otherwise? Purple and fine linen can readily pay one, two, three, or even four thousand dollars for the privilege of presenting itself before God in what is termed His house, and what fellowship can Christianity in velvet and broadcloth have for Christianity in less seemly garb?

But the plain, unfashionable people would not feel at home amongst us, say the wearers of the gay clothing. They naturally *prefer to be by themselves.* This is true enough, and so fashionable Christianity builds a mission church for unfashionable Christianity and its Sunday meditations are not therefore disturbed by any Dives and Lazarus contrasts being thrust before it. Of all the Protestant Churches in America, the writer's own church, the Episcopal, is generally styled the most aristocratic, but its Ritualistic wing has done and is doing much to relieve it from this imputation, and the Ritualistic clergy, as a whole, are little disposed to recognize class distinctions. Next after the Episcopal Church the Unitarian is perhaps the most exclusive, the one farthest removed from sympathy with the spiritual needs of the poor. Following this is the Presbyterian Church and about on the same line are the Congregationalist Church and, where the German traditions are fading, the Lutheran Church. In the light of a poor relation the Episcopal Church is disposed to consider the numerically great Methodist Church, and the Unitarian Church regards the Universalist Church in a similar way. Viewed from a social standpoint the Baptist Church is on the same plane as the Methodist, and in many cities the worshiper at either of these churches is socially dead. In a certain village in Western New York, where the writer once lived, the Episcopal and Presbyterian Churches held the balance of social power and the Methodists and Baptists were socially ignored with the exception of one family among the latter. "It must be very trying for the B——s to attend the Baptist Church," was a common saying in the village. It occasionally happens that the dominant church in a town is the Methodist or Baptist, but in the majority of cases social ostracism awaits the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

man or woman who belongs to either of these respectable bodies. Society practically assumes that all "the nice people" worship at Episcopal, Presbyterian, Unitarian, Congregationalist or Lutheran shrines, and no doubt society has legitimate grounds for its assumption if its standards are to be accepted. But let us see what is the state of affairs in these humbler Protestant Churches. Are there two Baptist Churches in a town? We may be very sure that one of these is more exclusive than the other. Are there two Methodist Churches in a town? We shall hear that "the better class of Methodists" attend one of these churches in preference to the other. The tolerant Presbyterian or Congregationalist will tell you that "really the better class of Methodists are more like ourselves," which he thinks is a very gracious, liberal-minded statement of the case, and "the better class of Methodists" affect to look down upon the preachers of their plainer co-religionists. Should there be several churches of one faith in any community the scale of respectability may have any number of degrees marked upon it, from the Gothic structure in the fashionable quarter to the mission chapel that has for neighbors saloons and squalid tenements.

The whole fabric of American Protestantism is inwrought with the notion that class distinctions must exist, must be intensified in fact, in the houses it erects to the worship of a Divine Being who is supposed to care nothing for such distinctions and whose Son, when on earth, consorted with fishermen and "the lower classes" generally in preference to the company of "nice people." Honorable exceptions exist here and there without doubt, but the great, stubborn fact remains that American Protestantism does foster an exclusive, aristocratic spirit. The humble mission chapel develops in time into a church. Its settees are replaced at length by cushioned pews; a costly carpet covers the floor that once boasted nothing better than a cocoa matting, an imposing organ succeeds the unpretentious melodeon, the sunlight comes at last through many-colored panes. All these things are certainly sweet and commendable in their nature, for it is surely right to beautify and enrich His temple to the best of our ability, but along with them the spirit of exclusiveness invariably creeps in, and after a time, Lazarus is made to feel that his rags are out of keeping in so fine a place and he is assured that he will feel much more at home in the new mission which the church has been so good as to build for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

him. And, once again, gay clothing and gold rings have it all their own way.

But all this is not the fault of Christianity or of American Protestantism, it is simply a fault inherent in human nature, it may be urged. Is this indeed so? Let us see.

A stone's-throw from the Protestant church may often be seen a church surpassing it in beauty, a church whose marbles are carved with even more richness of design, whose windows blaze with even deeper coloring, a church whose existence the Protestant would like to ignore even while he emulates its architecture, but which, when forced upon his notice, he characterizes as the church of the housemaids and Irish laborers.

"The housemaids' and laborers' church!" Heaven be praised that there *is* such a church, for Protestantism has little to offer these members of the community. At the door of this despised church is the holy-water stoup, the use of which is common to all the congregation, its presence at the entrance serving to emphasize the fact that worldly distinctions must be left outside the door. The wearer of the gay clothing and he of the tattered sleeve stand on an equal footing in this sanctuary. Dives and Lazarus kneeling side by side in a Roman Catholic temple is a sight that may often be seen, but the Protestant church-goer rarely beholds such a spectacle in his own church. Whatever the relative merits of the two faiths may be, one must admit that the Roman communion, in America at least, has encouraged, in the majority of cases, the idea of the equality of man in the presence of the Maker he has come to worship, while the Protestant communion has from the beginning fostered an aristocratic, exclusive spirit, which has resulted in making its churches but too often religious club-houses, and in deepening the caste distinctions which practically deny the brotherhood of man.

Say what we may, the Protestant Church has no place for the poor man within its pale. The wealthy churches snub him till he leaves them for unfashionable churches or omits to go to church altogether, and the churches which lay no claim to being fashionable are yet not overgracious to the very poor worshiper who ought to be content with the religious cold victuals proffered his kind at the mission chapel. It would not be pleasant to find a ragged, dirty stranger in our cushioned pew next Sunday. He would certainly be out of place there. These comfortable seats be for well-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nurtured, well-dressed Christians who have listened approvingly to the Gospel all their lives, and who are very far from hungering and thirsting for the Bread of Life. Away with you, Lazarus, to the mission chapel where you belong! You shall hear a tenth-rate preacher there whom you can better understand, and on Sunday afternoons we will graciously come there ourselves and question you about the Carpenter's Son, who had not where to lay his head, and the probable distance of Jericho from Jerusalem. We say to ourselves that the uncomfortably direct Bible texts relative to the poor and to our kinship with them are not intended to be taken literally. There must first be a careful study of surrounding conditions. What was suitable and proper to be done at the opening of the Christian era, and in Judea, is not at all the right thing to do now in these United States, nineteen hundred years later, and amongst a wholly different people. And, crowning argument of all, an attempt to follow out literally the New Testament teachings respecting those whom we have always with us, would infallibly result in upturning the foundations of society. And no doubt such literalism would bring with it just such a result. And the preservation of society is heaven's first law beyond question. Let us do nothing to violate it. After this manner do "the nice people" argue, and so Lazarus is sent around to Protestantism's back-door, the mission chapel, and Dives leans back in his pew and listens graciously when the clergyman admonishes him never to turn his face away from any poor man in order that the face of the Lord may never be turned away from him. Is it any wonder that Lazarus, his soul filled with the scornful reproof of the wealthy and with the despitefulness of the proud, sometimes fails to perceive the great kindness extended to him, and either turns from religion entirely or enters the church that makes him in his rags as welcome as the sinner who dines sumptuously every day?

American Protestantism has no acknowledged duties to perform to the poor man who is so unfortunate as to be within its pale, if we may judge by its bearing toward him. Judged by its works it is no system of faith for the poor man to cling to, whether he be respectably poor or utterly destitute. Whatever gracious message Protestantism may once have had for him it has none now, to all appearances. For years it has steadily turned its face away from the poor man. Its ears have long been dulled to the voice of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

poor man asking to be recognized as an equal before God in its temples. Its eyes are too dim to see aught of Lazarus but his rags.

Woe unto that faith that has no care for the feeble folk for whom Christ died! Woe unto that faith which preaches the gospel of pre-eminence to the rich and of humble submission to the poor! Woe unto that faith which gives to him that hath, and from him that hath not taketh away even that which he hath! And woe unto American Protestantism because of its pride, its hardness of heart, its "civilized heathenism" that wears the mask of Christianity and crucifies afresh the Master it assumes to adore!

OSCAR FAY ADAMS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SHERMAN'S OPINION OF GRANT.

In the January issue of the North American Review I published an editorial comment on an article that appeared in the preceding number, entitled "An Acquaintance with Grant," by General James B. Fry. In that article General Fry stated that General Sherman had gone so far as to have said since Grant's death that "had C. F. Smith lived Grant would have disappeared to history after Donelson."

This statement provoked a private correspondence through me between General Sherman and General Fry, which, after the exchange of two letters, threatened, I feared, to assume an aspect that might forestall any amicable outcome.

Moved by a sincere desire to avert this contingency, I endeavored to comply with the wish of General Sherman by suggesting a seemingly obvious interpretation of the phrase attributed to him. It seemed to me that General Sherman's whole record and relations to Grant proved that he must have meant to use the word "might" instead of "would"—speaking speculatively and not positively. It was not my purpose to discredit the good faith of General Fry, but solely my intention to prevent an undesirable personal discussion. Actuated by this sentiment, I did not feel called upon to transmit to General Fry the words of General Sherman contained in his dispatch of December 16th.

General Fry, in ignorance of my motives, was perhaps not unnaturally annoyed by the omission to state that he had given reasons for his refusal to comply with General Sherman's request, addressed to me a personal letter, the publication of which is not necessary to the history of this correspondence.

Since the appearance of these comments the following letter has been received from General Fry for publication in this issue:

30 E. 63d St., N. Y. City,
January 15, 1886.

To the Editor of the North American Review:

Sir: I have read the editorial remarks in your January issue upon the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

subject of my statement that General Sherman has said, since Grant's death, that had C. F. Smith lived, Grant would have disappeared to history after Donelson.

Your remarks suggest many reflections, which I deem it unnecessary for me to lay before your readers.

You say General Sherman repudiates the opinion attributed to him. There is a wide difference between repudiating an opinion and denying the expression of it. I have imputed no opinion to Gen. Sherman except such as may be inferred from the language he used. When Gen. Sherman denies that he used the language I have said he used, I shall consider myself called upon to furnish direct proof of the correctness of my statement.

Yours truly,

JAMES B. FRY.

In the meantime General Sherman, as will be seen, had addressed to me a series of communications, some of them written for publication, and others from which he now regretfully removes the seal of confidence.

Up to the 16th of January the publication of the following correspondence in its entirety, as requested by General Sherman, might possibly have been averted. But the appearance, on that day, in many leading journals, of a letter from General Sherman to the Rev. George Morrison, of Baltimore, published below, rendered such a course hopeless, as General Fry has personally expressed his desire to confront the issue at once.

I.

NEW YORK, *Dec.* 3, 1885.

GEN. JAMES B. FRY, New York City.

DEAR SIR: I inclose you a copy of a letter just received from Gen. Sherman.

Yours truly,

ALLEN THORNDIKE RICE.

II.

ST. LOUIS, *Dec.* 1, 1885.

ALLEN THORNDIKE RICE, ESQ.,

North American Review,

New York City.

DEAR SIR: Will you be kind enough to inquire of General Fry from what paper he made the extract in his article in your December number (An Acquaintance with Grant), "General Sherman goes so far as to have said, since Grant's death, that had C. F. Smith lived, Grant would have disappeared to history after Donelson; but that is conjecture."

Sincerely your friend,

W. T. SHERMAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

III.

30 E. 63d St., New York City, *Dec.* 5, 1885.

Mr. Allen Thorndike Rice,

Editor North American Review,

30 Lafayette Place, New York City.

Dear Sir: In my article called "An Acquaintance with Grant," published in your December issue, I assert that "General Sherman goes so far as to have said, since Grant's death, that had C. F. Smith lived, Grant would have disappeared to history after Donelson." I have just received your letter of the 3d instant, transmitting copy of a letter from General Sherman to you, dated Dec. 2, asking my authority for the foregoing statement. I do not understand that General Sherman denies the correctness of the statement attributed to him, or disavows the sentiment embodied in it. It, therefore, seems to me best to let the matter rest as it is.

If the correctness of my assertion should be denied, you would have a right to expect me to substantiate it, and I should feel bound to do so.

Yours very truly,

James B. Fry.

IV.

New York City, *Dec.* 7, 1885.

General W. T. Sherman, St. Louis, Mo.

Dear Sir: As soon as your note asking the authority for General Fry's statement reached me, I sent a copy of it to him, and inclose a copy of his reply.

Very truly yours,

Allen Thorndike Rice.

V.

Dec. 7, 1885.

Gen. James B. Fry,

30 East 63d St., New York City.

Dear General: I sent a copy of your letter to General Sherman as the quickest way of ascertaining whether he proposed to ask you formally for your authority or not.

Very truly yours,

Allen Thorndike Rice.

VI.

New York City, *Dec.* 12, 1885.

General James B. Fry, New York City.

Dear General: I have just received the following letter:—

912 Garrison Avenue,

St. Louis, Mo., *Dec.* 10, 1885.

Allen Thorndike Rice, Esq.,

North American Review,

New York City.

Dear Sir: I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of Dec. 7, inclosing the copy of one from General Fry, in answer to mine to you of the 1st, containing a simple request that he give me the source of a quotation he imputed to me in his article "Acquaintance with Grant," in your December number.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The matter cannot rest where it is," as he suggests, nor do I admit his right to call on me to affirm or deny the "sentiment" till I choose to do so in my own way.

In his article he quotes specific words from me. I therefore renew my demand for his authority. With great respect, your friend,

W. T. SHERMAN.

Kindly notify me what answer I shall make.

Very truly yours,

ALLEN THORNDIKE RICE.

VII.

NEW YORK CITY, *Dec.* 12, 1885.

GENERAL W. T. SHERMAN,
St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR GENERAL: I have just received your letter of the 10th instant, and have sent a copy of it to General Fry. It is possible that he may not receive it until Monday, in which case I presume I shall be able to transmit you a copy of his answer so as to reach you by Wednesday.

With great respect, very truly yours,

ALLEN THORNDIKE RICE.

VIII.

NEW YORK CITY, *Dec.* 14, 1885.

GENERAL W. T. SHERMAN,
St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR GENERAL: I have just received (Monday, Dec. 14th, 3 P.M.) a letter from General J. B. Fry, of which I subjoin a copy.

Very truly yours,

ALLEN THORNDIKE RICE.

30 E. 63D ST., NEW YORK CITY, *Dec.* 13, 1885.

MR. ALLEN THORNDIKE RICE,
North American Review,
City.

DEAR SIR: I have yours of yesterday, transmitting copy of a letter from Gen. Sherman, dated Dec. 10.

Without intending the slightest discourtesy to Gen. Sherman, I must say that I have no modification to make in my note to yours of the 5th instant.

Very truly yours,

JAMES B. FRY.

IX.

[*Telegram.*]

December 15, 1885.

To GEN. W. T. SHERMAN,
St. Louis.

Mailed you yesterday General Fry's reply: he writes:—

Without intending the slightest discourtesy to General Sherman, I must say I have no modification to make in my note to you.

JAMES B. FRY.

This is an acknowledgment of copy of yours Dec. 10.

Decisive.

ALLEN THORNDIKE RICE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

X.

[*Telegram.*]

ST. LOUIS, MO., *Dec.* 15.

TO ALLEN THORNDIKE RICE,

North American Review,

30 Lafayette Place, N. Y.

Despatch of to-day is received. Will it not be better for me to await General Fry's answer to my letter of Dec. 10. Meantime simply publish the fact, Gen. Sherman has asked Gen. Fry for the source of his quotation, which he has not yet supplied. I shall persevere in this inquiry till I know the truth. Meantime there is no hurry.

W. T. SHERMAN.

XI.

[*Telegram.*]

ST. LOUIS, MO., *Dec.* 16, 1885.

TO ALLEN THORNDIKE RICE,

North American Review,

New York.

Letter of the 14th with Fry's final answer, received. You can do what you please to elucidate the truth, and I would like your January number to contain my denial of the literal truth of Fry's quotation in your own language, not mine. Notify Fry that I believe he purposely and maliciously misrepresented me, and that the end is not yet.

W. T. SHERMAN.

XII.

912 GARRISON AVENUE,
SAINT LOUIS, MO., *Dec.* 17, 1885.

GENERAL R. C. DRUM,

Adjutant-General U. S. Army,

Washington, D. C.

GENERAL: In the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, edited by Allen Thorndike Rice, for December, 1885, is printed an article entitled "An Acquaintance with Grant," by General James B. Fry, in which occurs this paragraph:

"The time has not come for final judgment of Grant. He had great abilities and great opportunities. Chance is undoubtedly an important factor in the race of glory, and perhaps it favored Grant in the war of rebellion. General Sherman goes so far as to have said, since Grant's death, that 'had C. F. Smith lived, Grant would have disappeared to history after Donelson,' but that is conjecture. Grant was one of the 'singular few' who possessed qualities which probably would have gained for him a high place in history, no matter who had lived to compete with him in our great war."

When my attention was called to it I wrote the editor the following letter:

[Here follows the letter from Gen. Sherman dated December 1, and printed above in Section III.]

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To this I received by due course of mail a letter from Mr. Rice, of December 7, inclosing a copy of Gen. Fry's answer, as follows:

[Here follows Gen. Fry's letter, dated December 7, printed above in Section III.]

I have never authorized General Fry to speak for me in matters requiring the use of precise language, and I surely take direct issue with him in the modern monstrous newspaper doctrine that a reporter may publish any falsehood or guess, leaving the victim to follow it up with a denial or qualification. I assert moreover that General Fry is an officer of the army, subject to discipline and bound in honor to answer such an inquiry as was addressed to him.

I therefore, with all due respect, lay the matter before the honorable Secretary of War, and invoke his authority to compel General Fry to disclose the source of his information or to qualify his positive assertion that "General Sherman goes so far as to have said since Grant's death that had C. F. Smith lived Grant would have disappeared to history after Donelson."

With great respect, your servant,

W. T. SHERMAN,

General.

XIII.

WAR DEPARTMENT, ADJT. GENERAL'S OFFICE,
WASHINGTON, *Dec.* 23, 1885.

GENERAL W. T. SHERMAN,

U. S. Army,

St. Louis, Mo.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of the 17th instant, embodying certain letters from you to Mr. Rice, editor of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, and General James B. Fry's letters in answer thereto, on the subject of certain statements made by General Fry in an article in the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

The question how far the unauthorized use, by an officer, of the expressions of another may render the former amenable to discipline, is a difficult one to answer, especially when the language imputed is not offensive or calculated to cast odium on the speaker or writer. If the quotations used by General Fry in his article were false and scandalous, or so garbled as to give a false impression of your utterances, he has laid himself open to grave accusations, but as there is nothing to indicate that the statement is of that character or that his intent was to do you injustice or injury, the Secretary of War instructs me to say he cannot see that it is in his power, under the law, to take in this case the action suggested in your letter. At the same time he is of opinion that the question raised is one of good manners and proper courtesy, rather than of conduct subjecting General Fry to military discipline.

I am, General, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

R. C. DRUM,

Adjutant-General.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

XIV.

912 GARRISON AVE.,

ST. LOUIS, MO., *Jan.* 2, 1886.

ALLEN THORNDIKE RICE, ESQ.,

North American Review,

New York.

DEAR SIR: I have the REVIEW for January, and notice the manner in which you treat the Sherman-Fry matter. It is well and skillfully done, but you do not know Fry as well as Grant and I did. He invented that quotation to set up a man of straw for the honor of knocking it down.

General Grant always regarded him (Fry) as one of the men most active in spreading the lies about us at Shiloh—"surprise," "bayoneted in our beds," "demoralized," "a cowering mass on the river bank," etc., etc.—and his December article shows that Grant listened to him, as he could not help doing, replying little.

Now, for illustration, send to Van Nostrand for a little book, published in 1884, "The Army under Buell." Fry, on page 8: "During the seven months, including the winter season, he (Buell) organized and disciplined an army which had no superior, etc. Moved with the main body of his army to Pittsburg Landing, rescued Grant's army at the battle of Shiloh, and converted the disaster of the first day on that memorable field into a victory on the second day." Again, on page 10: "Pressing their advantage, the Union armies of the Tennessee, under Grant, and of the Ohio, under Buell, concentrated at Pittsburg Landing, on the Tennessee, when, being attacked on the 6th of April, *they* gained the victory of Shiloh."

Then turn to "Grant's Memoirs," pages 330–331, *et seq.*, and read his plain, truthful narrative. General Buell did not reach the field of battle until the first day was over. He came out to me a mile and a half from the Landing, after dark, with Fry and others, and I talked with both. On that first day we had fought from morning till night short of one division of our own army (Lew Wallace's); had sustained a loss of 8,000 men, and inflicted a like loss to our enemy, holding our ground against superior numbers, and covering every vital point of our position. We of the Army of the Tennessee claimed a victory at night. Lew Wallace having arrived with 6,000 men before Buell appeared, General Grant ordered me in person to assume the offensive the next morning at daylight.

Now, on the morning of the 6th of April, Wallace was only six miles off, and we expected him momentarily; still he did not cross the bridge, which I covered till night. One division of Buell's army (Nelson's), which had marched from Nashville to Savannah most leisurely, was there on the evening of April 5, and General Grant ordered it to march toward Pittsburg Landing. The firing was heard at Savannah early the morning of the 6th, yet the division did not start till after noon of the 6th, and its advance brigade (Ammen's) only reached the "Landing" about dark *after* the day's battle was over, losing, as General Grant describes, two men killed and one wounded. (Official report, one killed, two wounded.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That night the rebels were as much demoralized and *more* than we. Buell got up two other divisions (Crittenden's and McCook's), and the battle of the 7th was a "walk-over," the losses being not one-fourth of the day before. We were everywhere victorious.

We did not know that we had been surprised and slaughtered in our beds. We believed we had heroically defended our position till reinforcements, *near* and *long* expected, did arrive, until the newspapers came from the North full and complete. Our families mourned us as dead, with the blush of shame that we had set down like a parcel of cowards, to be knocked over with clubs. These accounts were written by cowards, and fugitives who fled from the field and did not stop till they reached Paducah, Cairo, and Cincinnati. Their accounts were verified by men who never commanded even a brigade, and who reached the battle-field from the rear, always presenting a sickening sight, and sent forth their reports damaging to the brave and gallant men of the Army of the Tennessee, who did fight hard and successfully on the 6th of April, 1862. General Grant's account is as near correct and true as any single man who was on the field can make it. I can have no newspaper controversy with General Fry, or anybody else, if avoidable; but when Fry sent me his volume before referred to, I called his attention to the renewal of his old controversy, sent the letter through General Grant, who, August 4, 1884, wrote me that he, too, had noticed Fry's "assumption," but in his memoirs he would confine himself to the simple statement of facts.

Fry loves notoriety, controversy; is wordy, but not profound. He wants to be considered as Buell's mouth-piece, and the champion of the Army of the Cumberland. He quotes me; refuses to give me the source of his quotation, but admits his liability to you. I will be pleased if you call on him to substantiate his quotation.

With respect, yours, etc.,
W. T. SHERMAN.

XV.

912 GARRISON AVENUE,
ST. LOUIS, MO., *Jan.* 10, 1886.

ALLEN THORNDIKE RICE, ESQ.,
Editor North American Review,
New York City.

DEAR SIR: . . . I approve of your comment wholly. I can have no controversy with General Fry, who, in my judgment, is a man of words, not of deeds; who, when cornered, will dodge the issue and run off into an entirely different matter.

I write hundreds of letters of which I have no copy. I meet thousands of people with whom I am compelled to converse, and with these I may have speculated as to what *might* have been had General C. F. Smith lived, and had General Grant gone to the rear after the battles of "Henry" and "Donelson" or "Shiloh," but that I ever questioned his peculiar qualities and ability is simply impossible. You know that I asked through you of General Fry to give me the source of his quotation not only once but twice, and he wanted the matter to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

remain as it was when he knew that I felt aggrieved at what I believed a false quotation. Yet up to this date he has withheld a compliance with this simple request.

Of course, I believe, he invented the quotation for the purpose of questioning it, and showing his friendship after death, for the man whom in life he attempted to malign.

With great respect, your friend,

W. T. SHERMAN.

XVI.

ST. LOUIS, Mo., *Jan.* 12, 1886.

THE REV. GEORGE MORRISON,

Baltimore.

DEAR SIR: I received your letter of the 7th, with newspaper slip inclosed. Of course I have read carefully the first volume of "General Grant's Memoirs," and regard it as admirable in every sense, and now await the second volume, which I doubt not will be equally valuable and interesting.

From the day I reported to him from Paducah till his death our relations were as brothers rather than as commander and commanded, and it is utterly impossible that I could have written or spoken the words as quoted in the December number of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

I have a very large correspondence, and converse freely with thousands of people, and, as is natural,—we often speculate what might have been had General Grant gone to the rear and C. F. Smith fought the battle of Shiloh; what might have been had Washington accepted his warrant in the English navy, etc., but that I could have written the positive expression that had "C. F. Smith lived General Grant would have disappeared from history," is an impossibility. Personally I want to live in peace, to avoid all controversy, but am confident in good time we shall learn on what authority or hearsay this publication is based. I inclose with this a slip containing my last public utterance about General Grant when I announced his death to his old comrades of the Army of the Tennessee. I don't believe any man, living or dead, has borne more willing testimony to General Grant's great qualities, especially as demonstrated at Henry, Donelson, Shiloh, and Vicksburg than myself.

Yours truly, W. T. SHERMAN.

The above correspondence furnishes in chronological sequence all the facts in the case.

ALLEN THORNDIKE RICE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

I.

In a recent conversation with Colonel Ingersoll, it was stated that Elizur Wright had written for The North American Review a remarkable article on Life Insurance—his last contribution to the American press. This paper will be published in an early number. I found that Colonel Ingersoll had been a personal friend of Mr. Wright, as, a few days subsequently, I received this touching and eloquent tribute to the dead reformer from the pen of the famous orator:

ELIZUR WRIGHT.

Another hero has fallen asleep—one who enriched the world with an honest life.

Elizur Wright was one of the Titans who attacked the monsters—the gods—of his time—one of the few whose confidence in liberty was never shaken, and who, with undimmed eyes, saw the atrocities and barbarisms of his day and the glories of the future.

When New York was degraded enough to mob Arthur Tappan, the noblest of her citizens; when Boston was sufficiently infamous to howl and hoot at Harriet Martineau, the grandest Englishwoman that ever touched our soil; when the North was dominated by theology and trade, by piety and piracy; when we received our morals from merchants, and made merchandise of our morals, Elizur Wright held principle above profit, and preserved his manhood at the peril of his life.

When the rich, the cultured, and the respectable,—when church members and ministers, who had been "called" to preach the "glad tidings," and when statesmen like Webster, joined with blood-hounds, and in the name of God hunted men and mothers, this man rescued the fugitives and gave asylum to the oppressed.

During those infamous years—years of cruelty and national degradation—years of hypocrisy, and greed, and meanness, beneath the reach of any English word, Elizur Wright became acquainted with the orthodox church. He found that Christians were willing to enslave men and women for whom they said that Christ had died—that they would steal the babe of a Christian mother, although they believed that the mother would be their equal in heaven forever. He found that those who loved their enemies would enslave their friends—that people who, when smitten on one cheek turned the other, were ready, willing, and anxious to mob and murder those who simply said, "The laborer is worthy of his hire." The church was in favor of slavery, not only of the body but of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the mind. According to the creeds, God himself was an infinite master and all his children serfs. He ruled with whip and chain, with pestilence and fire. Devils were his blood hounds, and hell his place of eternal torture.

Elizur Wright said to himself, why should we take chains from bodies and enslave minds—why fight to free the cage and leave the bird a prisoner? He became an enemy of orthodox religion—that is to say, a friend of intellectual liberty.

He lived to see the destruction of legalized larceny, to read the Proclamation of Emancipation; to see a country without a slave, a flag without a stain. He lived long enough to reap the reward for having been an honest man—long enough for his "disgrace" to become a crown of glory—long enough to see his views adopted and his course applauded by the civilized world—long enough for the hated word "abolitionist" to become a title of nobility—a certificate of manhood, courage, and true patriotism.

Only a few years ago the heretic was regarded as an enemy of the human race. The man who denied the inspiration of the Jewish Scriptures was looked upon as a moral leper, and the atheist as the worst of criminals. Even in that day Elizur Wright was grand enough to speak his honest thought, to deny the inspiration of the bible—brave enough to defy the God of the orthodox church—the Jehovah of the Old Testament—the Eternal Jailer—the Everlasting Inquisitor.

He contended that a good God would not have upheld slavery and polygamy—that a loving Father would not assist some of his children to enslave or exterminate their brethren—that an infinite Being would not be unjust, irritable, jealous, revengeful, ignorant, and cruel.

And it was his great good fortune to live long enough to find the intellectual world on his side—long enough to know that the greatest naturalists, philosophers, and scientists, agreed with him—long enough to see certain words change places, so that "heretic" was honorable and "orthodox" an epithet. To-day the heretic is known to be a man of principle and courage—one blest with enough mental independence to tell his thought. To-day, the thoroughly orthodox means the thoroughly stupid.

Only a few years ago it was taken for granted that an "unbeliever" could not be a moral man—that one who disputed the inspiration of the legends of Judea could not be sympathetic and humane, and could not really love his fellow-men. Had we no other evidence upon this subject, the noble life of Elizur Wright would demonstrate the utter baselessness of these views.

His life was spent in doing good—in attacking the hurtful—in defending what he believed to be the truth. Generous beyond his means—helping others help themselves—always hopeful, busy, just, cheerful, filled with the spirit of reform—a model citizen, always thinking of the public good—devising ways and means to save something for posterity—feeling that what he had he held in trust—loving nature, familiar with the poetic side of things, touched to enthusiasm by the beautiful thought, the brave word, and the generous deed—friendly in manner, candid and kind in speech—modest but persistent—enjoying leisure as only the industrious can—loving and gentle in his family—hospitable, judging men and women regardless of wealth, position, or public

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

clamor—physically fearless—intellectually honest—thoroughly informed—unselfish, sincere, and reliable as the attraction of gravitation. Such was Elizur Wright—one of the staunchest soldiers that ever faced and braved for freedom's sake the wrath, and scorn, and lies of place and power.

A few days ago I met this genuine man. His interest in all human things was just as deep and keen—his hatred of oppression, his love of freedom, just as intense, just as fervid as on the day I met him first. True, his body was old, but his mind was young; and his heart, like a spring in the desert, bubbled over as joyously as though it had the secret of eternal youth. But it has ceased to beat, and the mysterious veil that hangs where sight and blindness are the same—the veil that revelation has not drawn aside—that science cannot lift, has fallen once again between the living and the dead.

And yet we hope and dream. May be the longing for another life is but the prophecy, forever warm from Nature's lips, that love, disguised as death, alone fulfills. We cannot tell. And yet, perhaps this Hope is but an antic, following the fortunes of an uncrowned king, beguiling grief with jest, and satisfying loss with pictured gain? We do not know.

But, from the Christian's cruel hell, and from his heaven more heartless still, the free and noble soul, if forced to choose, should loathing turn, and cling with rapture to the thought of endless sleep.

But this we know: Good deeds are never childless. A noble life is never lost. A virtuous action does not die. Elizur Wright scattered with generous hand the priceless seeds, and we shall reap the golden grain. His words and acts are ours, and all he nobly did is living still.

Farewell, brave soul! Upon thy grave I lay this tribute of respect and love. When last our hands were joined, I said these parting words: "Long life!" and I repeat them now.

ROBERT G. INGERSOLL.

II.

I wish to make some suggestions as to the articles contributed by Chief-Justice Hargis on "The Law's Delay," and by Judge Learned on "The Tardiness of Justice."

According to the learned chief-justice, the principal sources of the law's delay and defects originate "in the venality, neglect, or incapacity of legislators!" But, if more worthy, what could they do to remove those evils? Could they instruct the courts, or make the course of judicial administration more simple, certain, or direct? No. But the legislature of any State might make the lawyer's work more easy by adopting the "New York Code of Procedure of 1848," every part of which has received judicial construction. The "red tape, or useless technical forms," of which the chief-justice complains, might thus be superseded.

He refers to the bulk and conflict of our laws, to the reports in which law and *dicta* are so commingled as to "render it a physical impossibility for the judges to examine all of them on every question." Did any judge, not a mere 'prentice hand, ever have occasion to do that?

In view of our present condition, the chief-justice thinks that "the codifi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cation of American law is a growing and urgent necessity." But such a code could not contain all that law. It follows, that under such a code the cases contested before the courts would fall into several classes. Thus, the class to which the code applies, another to be governed by analogies, other cases which will depend on principles of natural justice, and on old rules of law. A judge might even then find his work as severe as at present. He will yet need the books now in use. He will need the practice reports, which will—often conflicting—give construction to the provisions of that code; also the reports of cases determined on appeals, with the opinions of judges, law, and *dicta*, after the common experience. In a few years his law library will contain thousands of volumes, ever increasing in number, as with the French, after their code, and in less than fifty years another codification may be an urgent necessity.

A few words as to the other article must suffice. Our judicial work is not shown to be tardy by contrasting it with our progress in other relations, nor does the statement that Lord Ellenborough "tried seventeen defended cases" in a single day help the argument. No judge, early or late, ever aspired to such monstrous celerity. Nor is it just or logical to support the charge of tardiness by citing a few cases which have lingered in the courts for years, without regard to the vast number of cases, which, in the same courts and years, have been contested and determined.

It is true that the Supreme Court of the United States, and the New York Court of Appeals, are greatly in arrear in their business. The remedy is not by denying suitors the right of appeal, but by reorganizing those courts. Let the Constitutions of the United States and of New York be so amended, that another co-ordinate branch of each of those courts may be created. Congress, and the New York Legislature, could appoint commissioners competent to classify, once for all, the nature of the business that should come before each of those courts.

JOSEPH NEILSON.

III.

THE following extract is found in the Keily correspondence submitted to the Senate in December, and afterwards published:

"It is to be remembered that one of the most acceptable Ministers ever sent by the United States to Austria, Mr. John A. Kasson, was first nominated for the Madrid mission, and that Spain objected to receive him because of his alleged public sympathy with the separatist movement in Cuba. The political objections to Mr. Keily, namely, want of political tact, and fear of wounding the sensibilities of a friendly State, might have been urged with equal or greater force against Mr. Kasson; but he seems to have been more fortunate than Mr. Keily, and no sinister influence undermined his position and opposed obstacles to the recognition of his personal worth and intellectual merits."

This rumor of an objection by Spain to Mr. Kasson was put in vogue in 1877 by reason of his appointment to Vienna soon after the announcement of his designation for Madrid. In fact he was never appointed to Madrid, but was offered, and had intimated his acceptance of the offer of the Spanish mission, when the post at Vienna became vacant. Then Secretary Evarts gave him his option between the two posts, and Mr. Kasson accepted and was ap-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pointed to Vienna. The rumor of an objection by Spain had no foundation in fact, as fully appears from the following note recently addressed to Mr. Kasson by ex-Secretary (now Senator) Evarts:

"WASHINGTON, D. C., *January* 5, 1886.

"HON. JOHN A. KASSON, Washington:

"DEAR SIR: In answer to your inquiry touching the statement that the Spanish Government made objection to your appointment as Minister to that country in 1877, and during my term as Secretary of State, I take pleasure in saying that no such question was ever raised. The appointment for Madrid, originally proposed by me, was changed, upon your preference, to Vienna; and for reasons having no connection whatever with, or knowledge of, either government. I am, very truly yours,

[Signed] "WM. M. EVARTS."

IV.

THE disparity of conditions in society springs largely from the privilege one part of society has of taxing the other part. When this privilege of private taxation is destroyed it will be impossible for a few individuals to garner into their coffers the wealth of the world, or to acquire the custody of the land. The remedy should not lie in the direction of limiting the amount of wealth that any individual shall possess, lest it destroy one of the incentives to industry, by prohibiting the acceptance of a legitimate reward for superior skill and foresight.

The governing classes in society would do well to see to it, and that quickly, that no industrious laborer, willing to work, shall be compelled to suffer and see his family suffer because of an enforced idleness; and this they can do by opening the land, which is the common heritage, to the honest settler and to him only. A well directed system of taxation on the land speculator's holdings would result in immediate relief, and ultimate relief would come from the reclamation to common ownership of all the land.

The overcrowding of the professions, the 1,500,000 unemployed laborers in our country, the superinduced deathless competition among those seeking employment—bringing wages down to the starvation point—the tremendous concentration of capital lying idle in bank vaults, are a few of the conditions from which spring Communism, Socialism, and threats of anarchy. Society is daily breeding Jean Valjeans.

What the laboring man wants is not the confiscation or limitation of honestly acquired wealth, but a chance to enter the struggle for existence unhampered by artificial strictures. He only asks that no man or set of men shall be allowed to strangle the demand for his labor. To do him justice, rack rents must be prohibited, quit rents must be instituted. The law must say to the landlord as it does to the usurer: "So far but no farther." In this direction a law of limitation would be both beneficial and operative. Rent acts on our commercial machinery as the governor controls the speed of the engine. When rents are low the mills run night and day, the laborer gets good wages without pressing his claim by a strike, and money flows from the bank vaults into

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

channels of trade at an accelerated speed; but, when rents are high, the commercial machinery slackens, the mills close, failure follows failure, railroad traffic falls off, wages are reduced, strikes become frequent and money again accumulates in vast amounts. The bubble credit bursts, the financial and commercial system is convulsed, and a tremor of horror runs through the community from end to end. We understand how this is possible, when we remember that all legitimate commerce is but an exchange of labor, and that rent, or a charge for the use of the ground, is taken from the product of labor. When the shoemaker completes two pairs of shoes he should be able to purchase, that is exchange them for two pairs of shoes' worth of furniture, or clothing or coal, or any of the necessities or luxuries of life, but when one pair goes for rent he can purchase but half the quantity of these commodities, and can therefore employ but half the labor he otherwise could set in motion. By taking a portion of their labor without giving a return, the landlord prohibits one set of laborers from employing another set, and the intensity of this prohibition or degree of limitation varies with the rise and fall in rents.

A law similar to our usury laws, fixing a rent limit, with reversion of title to the State as the penalty, and allowing the tenant to come into court and petition forfeiture of his landlord's title, would do much and relieve the distress of our laborers, if it did not eradicate or limit man's avarice.

JAMES P. KOHLER.

V.

You will readily judge of the fairness and accuracy of Col. F. D. Grant's article in the REVIEW for December, by noting that the following dispatch should come in at the top of the 514th page, showing, that *before* Halleck's congratulation of Hunter, and *before* he recommended C. F. Smith for promotion—in fact two days before—he had recommended the promotion of Grant:

ST. LOUIS, *Feb.* 17, 1832, 1 P. M.

MAJOR-GENERAL MCCLELLAN:

Make Buell, Grant, and Pope major-generals of volunteers, and give me command in the West. I ask this in return for Forts Henry and Donelson.

H. W. HALLECK,
Major-General.

Col. Grant knew of this dispatch. It has been public in the "War Records," Vol. VII., page 628, since 1882.

Grant was nominated same day. Halleck asked it, and so *two* days before the dispatches Col. Grant gives about Hunter and C. F. Smith.

GEORGE C. BARTON.

VI.

In a private note accompanying the second part of his article on the campaign of Shiloh, General Beauregard records this interesting fact:

"Just before mounting our horses (on the morning of the second day's fight), it occurred to me to ascertain the pulsations of the human system in the excitement of going into battle. I requested my medical director, Dr. Brodie, to examine the pulses of myself and staff. He found that they varied from ninety to one hundred and thirty."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VII.

THERE is no error more common among the industrial classes than the belief, often expressed in their labor organizations, that capitalists, as a class, are without exception inimical to their interests. While there is often presented plausible evidence for this opinion, yet, both by words and deeds, some of these more fortunate contestants in the battle of life demonstrate their belief that there is need of such legislation or such measures of industrial co-operation as shall tend to distribute more equitably the fruits of our civilization among all classes of society. Among these representative men of wealth there are few more widely known or held in greater honor by their workmen than Pierre Lorrillard. Recently, when congratulated by a workingman for his brave action in the collision of his yacht with a ferry-boat, and warned of an impending conflict between capitalists and labor, he addressed to his correspondent the following letter, which has lately come into my hands, and which, I think, will be read with interest both by employers and employed:

HENRY MARKHAM, Esq.,

DEAR SIR: Your note with inclosure received; I do not usually answer letters personally as I have so much to attend to, but being at present laid up in the house by an accident which damaged my leg, I thought I would answer your letter.

Allow me to deny any heroic action in looking after my lady guests at the time my yacht collided with the ferry-boat. . . . For a long time I have taken a great and increasing interest in the welfare and happiness of the oppressed of Europe, and also a deep interest in the laboring classes of America, so many of whom I employ. No manufacturer is, I hope, more liked and trusted by his employees than myself, and while never yielding in the least to unjust demands, I have always tried to look after their welfare and happiness, and to gain their confidence and affection.

But the field is broader than my own affairs. I know the irresistible power of the masses, and I sympathize with them in their eternal struggle for existence. I feel for them, well knowing their daily efforts to keep the wolf from the door. Many times have I thought if some plan could not be devised to give them a more equal share in the good things of this life. How to ameliorate their condition is the question. Could not their leaders advise them to look upon the ballot as the most efficient instrumentality to produce for them a more satisfactory state of affairs? Communism is and always has been a failure. Co-operative works look well in theory, but they have generally failed; and yet I think we must look to them in the near future as the most practicable method of benefiting the laboring classes. When they have honest leaders who consider their welfare as the supreme consideration, we will find them acting with common sense. With communism in operation we would have financial ruin, distress, and want of employment, and it would end in military despotism.

The danger to the people by the accumulation of the enormous fortunes of the present day, and the fact of their being owned by persons who seem to have no respect, love, or common feeling for the people, seems to me a great and im-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

portant problem. In Europe, princes, kings, and persons of great wealth, use their means in a thousand ways for the gratification, happiness, and refinement of the people around them; whereas, in this country, they act selfishly, and they are, or appear to be, utterly indifferent to the suffering at their doors. As to your hint of an impending rising among the people, personally I have nothing to fear. Almost all my means are in my factories, and I will always be in the front rank of those who love the people, and shall do all in my power to check them in any madness that bad or ambitious leaders may advocate.

I hold that Labor's remedy is in the BALLOT. It now has a power stronger than armies or navies. By means of it the working classes can so wield the machinery of legislation as to give them all they can ask for in justice. I have no political ambition. I will never willingly enter into political life unless some uprising or concerted action on the part of labor makes it my duty to try to guide this rising tide. For *any* uprising, even if successful, would be of no benefit to the people unless it was directed by capable leaders. Destroy all the wealth and capital of the country, and you would spread financial ruin, deprive labor of employment, and in six months starvation would stare fifty millions of people in the face. When time brought its remedy, we would be the subjects of a modern Bonaparte or Cæsar.

If I should ever be tempted to take a part in public affairs, it shall be simply as a friend of the people. I want no office, and should accept nothing in the gift of the nation; but I should like to see labor organized in such a manner as I could easily suggest, with labor lodges organized on the principle of benevolent associations, and so thoroughly knit together that they would act as one man, thus make their views respected and their influence felt politically and at the election by their ballots. But to do this the Labor Party must not allow itself to be used as a party machine. Its officers must never take office from city, State, or nation. Its committees must be free from all political predilections. It must stand as pure as the Spartans before the world. If these perhaps Utopian ideas could be carried out, we might expect a more equitable division between capital and labor.

You who represent the laboring classes, would do well to consider if you could not find leaders equally true, fair, and honest among those you term "aristocrats"—leaders who would make the interests of labor and their own interests identical—men whose success in this world's affairs is due more to their own business ability and honesty than to the wiles of fate or fortune.

Yours respectfully,

PIERRE LORILLARD.

VIII.

IT makes glad the heart of man to read "Rome and the Inquisitions," in the December number of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. History so thoroughly confirms its statements! Mr. Glover tells us, that, yielding to the urgent appeals of Isabella, Sixtus, in 1480, consented to the establishment of the Inquisition in Spain, more for political than religious reasons, and that the pontiffs were ever ready to extend the hand of charity to those who sought protection from the fury of the inquisitors. Turning to the records, we find that the pope issued a bull in November, 1478, authorizing Ferdinand and Isa-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bella to appoint two or three bishops, or other dignitaries of the church, aged at least forty years, and graduates of theology, to seek after and discover all apostates, heretics, and their abettors, with full power to proceed against them. Isabella suspended the execution of the bull for two years. In January, 1481, the court was established in a Dominican convent at Seville. During that year, two hundred and ninety-eight "new Christians" were burnt in Seville alone. Some who were condemned appealed to Rome. The pontiff extended the hand of charity, revoked the authority he had given others to appoint inquisitors, reserving that right for himself. In the kindness of his heart he appointed that eminently just and merciful man, Torquemada, Inquisitor-General of the Kingdom of Castile.

Thus does history demonstrate the truth of Mr. Glover's assertion, that "the atrocities of the Spanish institution were thoroughly Spanish, and the Roman Church may hold herself irresponsible for them." Priests, bishops, cardinals, and popes, may be held responsible, but the Roman Church cannot be held responsible!

EUGENE MANTVERT.

IX.

IT is not true, as the author of the Great Psychical Opportunity asserts, that scientists have refused to give attention to such things, or that they have failed to account for the phenomena by recognized laws of matter and mind.

Clairvoyance is only a variety of fortune-telling, and its believers are satisfied with vague shadows, in which an occasional resemblance or coincidence fills their whole mental vision, to the eclipse of all dissimilarity and discrepancy. Mesmerism was thoroughly investigated during the first half of this century by leading European scientists; and, though many for a time were inclined to give more or less credit to its author's claims, the conclusions of Braid and Carpenter are generally accepted by scientific men: that is, the mesmeric state is only artificial somnambulism. As to dreams, they have the same claim to credibility as fortune-telling, and generally the same believers. The value of presentments is to be judged by the same standard. No note is taken of the failures, which vastly preponderate; while the most trivial fulfillment is magnified by fancy, so that there is no room in the scope of observation for the discrepancies. Apparitions are simply visual hallucinations. Always present in *mania a potu*, generally in other forms of mania, frequently in fevers, prolonged wakefulness, fasting, and prostration, and occasionally with delicate nervous organizations in ordinary health, they require no new principles to explain their occurrence. If truth of tenets be decided by number and honesty of adherents, Christianity must yield to Buddhism.

Spiritualism has been so mixed up with jugglery, that it is often difficult and sometimes impossible to eliminate the latter factor in the phenomena, so as to present a subject for legitimate study. Exposures of its impositions have been made by public lecturers, who performed the usual feats of the mediums and agreed to repeat any others which might be produced. Yet credit must be given to many mediums for honesty and sincerity. Stripped of jugglery and unconscious muscular action, which easily cover all the prodigies of inanimate objects, the performances of the writing and speaking mediums can be explained

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on grounds already laid down by physiologists. Every well-informed person is aware that muscular actions which are under control of the will, are *habitually performed without its exercise and often without consciousness.* Fewer persons are aware that mental operations are also carried on without act of will or consciousness, even in waking moments, while the will completely and consciousness mainly are in abeyance during the dreams of sleep. The mind of the writing medium operates without governance of the will, just as his hand does in the writing, but consciousness of the mental and muscular acts is generally preserved, though sometimes only partially so. The same explanation applies to the performances of speaking or trance-mediums. It is quite unnecessary to suppose that either medium is actuated by any force or intelligence exterior to himself. So far as the mental operations are outside his own will, they are essentially dreams, and have no more coherency nor correctness than dreams.

It is a mistake to suppose that spiritualism is capable of any practical and useful application, Its votaries have had about forty years to develop it into a system, and millions of supposed communications from another sphere have been obtained. If such revelations have any value, it must long ago have been realized by speculators of every class, but they have been as fruitless as fortune-telling ; yet no amount of abstract reasoning nor uniform failure can convince credulous minds. Moreover spiritualism, for most of its votaries, has the sanctity of religion. It is received by faith without evidence, or contrary to the best evidence. Such people are not convinced by cold argument, are sensitive, and are best let alone. In a mixed company it is now safer to discuss Christianity and the late civil war than spiritualism.

To sum up, these supposed occult phenomena have received due attention, have been found conformable to established laws, and have been relegated to the realm of witchcraft and other delusions. The extirpation of such belief is a fruitless and hopeless undertaking, and men of science should not be asked to waste their time in useless missionary work. S. S. HERRICK, M. D.

X.

TOWARD the close of his article in the November number of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, Dr. Schaff says: " . . we shall probably have a good deal of trouble yet . . . with the public schools, where the civil and ecclesiastical interests come in contact." He then goes on to point out the advantages of the separation of church and state. Permit me to ask if there is one such advantage that might not have its counterpart arising from the separation of *school* and state. Full *educational* liberty ought to be just as highly prized as "full religious liberty." State *schoolism* "makes men rely on the help of the government," just as much as "State churchism" does. In the rapidly increasing capitals of this country, the nominally educated magistrates become more and more indifferent to their duty toward the education that they profess to believe in. In other words, adequate school accommodations are as difficult to obtain in our large cities as are adequate church accommodations in European cities. Are not freedom and independence the best conditions for the growth and prosperity of *schools*, as well as churches ?

H. J. CHASE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED